

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS UNIVERSITATIS ALBERTAENSIS





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2020 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Eddy1968>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE RELATIONSHIP OF LOCAL-COSMOPOLITAN ROLE
ORIENTATION TO ORGANIZATIONAL
CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS

by

WESLEY PERCY EDDY



A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

APRIL, 1968

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "The Relationship of Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation to Organizational Characteristics of Schools" submitted by Wesley Percy Eddy in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

ABSTRACT OF THE STUDY

The general problem of the study was to determine whether teachers with differing orientations had differential perceptions of and satisfactions with the organization of the schools in which they worked. Nine specific derivative hypotheses involving relationships among school bureaucratization, local-cosmopolitan role-orientation, satisfaction with organization, and teacher characteristics were presented and tested.

The sample consisted of 339 teachers from twenty Alberta schools. A twelve-item instrument was developed by which judges could rate the level of bureaucratization of schools. For the second major variable, teachers were classified according to their local-cosmopolitan orientation by use of a sixteen-item self-rating instrument. Instruments were also developed by which teachers could rate their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the school organization, and to report a number of personal and professional characteristics.

The study confirmed several of the hypotheses and rejected several others. (1) Teachers' description or perception of the level of bureaucratization was found to be related to the organizational classification of schools. Teachers were able to rate their schools as high or low

bureaucratic. (2) There was, however, no significant relationship between whether teachers were locals or cosmopolitans and their rating of the school. (3) Teachers were significantly more satisfied in high bureaucratic schools. (4) It was found, however, that teachers who were locals were more satisfied than were cosmopolitans with the organizational characteristics of schools.

(5) While teachers classed as locals were more loyal to, and more satisfied with the organization generally, this satisfaction was not affected by whether the school organization was high or low in degree of bureaucratization.

(6) There was little difference between reactions of administrators to locals and cosmopolitans. (7) Certain characteristics seemed to distinguish teachers who were locals from those who were cosmopolitans. Teachers who were cosmopolitans had more years of academic and professional training, and expressed less satisfaction with teaching as a career than locals. Cosmopolitans were also somewhat younger, taught at a higher grade level, and were less likely to have attended school in the district in which they were teaching than locals. (8) Those teachers who perceived more bureaucracy in their schools were somewhat more likely to have less training, to be teaching at lower grade levels, and to be more satisfied with teaching as a career than teachers who perceived less bureaucracy.

(9) Teachers who were more satisfied with their school organization had significantly less experience teaching in the same school than teachers who were less satisfied with the school organization.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

1207 EAST 58TH STREET, CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

TEL: (773) 707-5000 FAX: (773) 707-5001

INTERNET: <http://www.uchicago.edu>

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the presentation of this thesis, the writer wishes to acknowledge with grateful thanks the cooperation and assistance he has received from many sources. Especially, he wishes to thank his adviser, Dr. Miklos, for the invaluable assistance and encouragement he offered during the period of the study. Thanks are also extended to the other members of the committee.

Appreciation is expressed to the superintendents, principals, and teachers who participated in the study.

The writer is also indebted for the financial assistance received from the University of Alberta, and the Province of Alberta.

Finally, the writer wishes to acknowledge with deepest gratitude, the patience, encouragement, and assistance of his wife without whom this study would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Significance of the Problem	3
Delimitations, Limitations, and	
Assumptions	6
Delimitations	6
Limitations	7
Assumptions	7
Organization of Thesis	8
II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	10
Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation	10
Bureaucratic Organizations	15
Definition of Terms	20
Statement of Hypotheses	21
Sub-Problem 1	23
Hypothesis 1	23
Hypothesis 2	24
Sub-Problem 2	24
Hypothesis 3	24
Hypothesis 4	24
Sub-Problem 3	24
Hypothesis 5	25

CHAPTER	PAGE
Sub-Problem 4	25
Hypothesis 6	25
Sub-Problem 5	25
Hypothesis 7	26
Sub-Problem 6	26
Hypothesis 8	26
Sub-Problem 7	27
Hypothesis 9	27
Summary	27
III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES	30
Method of Collection of Data	30
The Measure of Local-Cosmopolitan Role	
Orientation	31
Pilot Study I	34
The School Bureaucracy Inventory	37
Pilot Study II	39
The Measure of Satisfaction with the	
Organization	43
Teacher Characteristics	43
Summary	44
IV. RESEARCH DESIGN	46
The Sample	46
Differentiating Between Locals and	
Cosmopolitans	51

CHAPTER	PAGE
Descriptive Data on Teachers	51
Statistical Analysis	58
Multiple Linear Regression Analysis	58
Chi Square	65
V. ANALYSIS OF DATA: PERCEPTION OF AND SATIS-	
FACTION WITH ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE	68
Teachers' Perception of School	
Organization	69
Results	70
Hypothesis 1	70
Hypothesis 2	73
Discussion	74
Teachers' Satisfaction with the School	
Organization	76
Results	76
Hypothesis 3	76
Hypothesis 4	80
Hypothesis 5	83
Discussion	83
Reactions to Teachers	86
Results	86
Hypothesis 6	86
General Results	89
Results for All Schools	89

CHAPTER	PAGE
Comparison of Responses in High and Low Bureaucratic Schools	93
Discussion	96
Summary	97
VI. ANALYSIS OF DATA: TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS . . .	100
Teacher Characteristics and Role	
Orientation	100
Results	100
Discussion	108
Teacher Characteristics in Relation to	
Perception of Bureaucracy	109
Results	109
Discussion	116
Teacher Characteristics in Relation to	
Satisfaction with School Organization . . .	117
Results	117
Discussion	121
Summary	124
VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . . .	126
Summary	126
The Problem	126
Sample	127
Instrumentation	127
Methodology	128

CHAPTER	PAGE
Sub-Problems and Hypotheses	128
Results	130
Hypothesis 1	130
Hypothesis 2	131
Hypothesis 3	131
Hypothesis 4	132
Hypothesis 5	132
Hypothesis 6	133
Hypothesis 7	133
Hypothesis 8	134
Hypothesis 9	135
Conclusions	136
Implications	139
Implications for the Practice of	
School Administration	139
Implications for Further Research	141
BIBLIOGRAPHY	145
APPENDICES	150
APPENDIX A: Instruments Used in Pilot Study I	151
SECTION I: Teacher Questionnaire	152
Covering Letter	153
PART I: Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmo-	
politan Role Orientation (Interim).	154

CHAPTER

PAGE

PART II:	Instrument to Measure Teachers' Perception of the Degree of Bureaucracy of Schools (Interim)	157
PART III:	Instrument to Measure Teachers' Degree of Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction with School Organization (Interim)	161
PART IV:	Teacher Characteristics Questionnaire	163
SECTION II:	Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation (Interim) Used in Pilot Study Retest	166
SECTION III:	Principal's Perception of Teachers' Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation	170
APPENDIX B:	Instruments Used in Pilot Study II.	173
	Covering Letter	174
PART I:	School Bureaucracy Inventory (Interim) to Rate Most Bureaucratic School	175
PART II:	Confidence in Judgment Scale	179
PART III:	School Bureaucracy Inventory (Interim) to Rate Least Bureaucratic School	180
PART IV:	Confidence in Judgment Scale	184
APPENDIX C:	Superintendents' Questionnaire for Rating of Schools	185

CHAPTER	PAGE
PART I:	School Bureaucracy Inventory Used in
	Choosing Most Bureaucratic School 186
PART II:	Confidence in Judgment Scale 190
PART III:	School Bureaucracy Inventory Used
	in Choosing Least Bureaucratic
	School 191
PART IV:	Confidence in Judgment Scale 195
APPENDIX D:	Teacher Questionnaire Used in Study . . 196
	Covering Letter 197
PART I:	Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmo-
	politan Role Orientation 198
PART II:	Instrument to Measure Teachers'
	Perception of the Degree of
	Bureaucracy of Schools 201
PART III:	Instrument to Measure Teachers'
	Degree of Satisfaction or Dissatis-
	faction with School Organization . . . 205
PART IV:	Teacher Characteristics Questionnaire . 207
APPENDIX E:	Principals' Questionnaire Used in
	Study 210
APPENDIX F:	Descriptive Data on Sample: Number
	of Full-Time Teachers Reported by
	Schools 213

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Item-Total Score Correlation on Local-Cosmo- politan Role Orientation Scale as Determined by Pilot Study Number I	35
II. Scores of Schools Considered to be High Bureau- cratic on School Bureaucracy Inventory by Item	40
III. Scores of Schools Considered to be Low Bureau- cratic on School Bureaucracy Inventory by Item	42
IV. Superintendents' Ratings of High Bureaucratic and Low Bureaucratic Schools	49
V. Distribution and Classification of Respondents by Total Score on the Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation	52
VI. Comparison of Numbers of Teachers in High and Low Bureaucratic Schools on Sex, Marital Status, and Age	54
VII. Comparison of Numbers of Teachers in High and Low Bureaucratic Schools on Academic and Professional Training, Teaching Experience, and Experience Teaching in Same School	55

TABLE

PAGE

VIII.	Comparison of Numbers of Teachers in High and Low Bureaucratic Schools on Number of Systems in Which Employed, Grade Level Taught, and Whether They Attended School in District in Which Now Teaching	56
IX.	Comparison of Numbers of Teachers in High and Low Bureaucratic Schools on Satisfaction with Teaching and Hours per Week Worked . . .	57
X.	Means and Standard Deviations of Teachers' Perception of Bureaucracy and Satisfaction with Bureaucracy in High Bureaucratic and Low Bureaucratic Schools	57
XI.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance Design	63
XII.	Mean Level of Bureaucratic Characteristics as Perceived by Teachers in High Bureau- cratic and Low Bureaucratic Schools	69
XIII.	Regression Analysis Results of Teachers' Perception of the Level of Bureaucracy	71
XIV.	Mean Satisfaction of Teachers in High Bureau- cratic and Low Bureaucratic Schools	77
XV.	Regression Analysis Results of Teachers' Satisfaction with School Organization (I). . .	78

TABLE

PAGE

XVI.	Regression Analysis Results of Teachers' Satisfaction with School Organization (II) . . .	82
XVII.	Principals' Reactions to Teachers in Both High and Low Bureaucratic Schools in Relation to the Favorable Response Items . . .	90
XVIII.	Principals' Reactions to Teachers in Both High and Low Bureaucratic Schools in Relation to The Unfavorable Response Items . . .	92
XIX.	Comparison of Principals' Reactions to Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation of Teachers in High Bureaucratic and Low Bureaucratic Schools on Favorable Response Questions. . . .	94
XX.	Comparison of Principals' Reactions to Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation of Teachers in High Bureaucratic and Low Bureaucratic Schools On Unfavorable Response Questions	95
XXI.	Intercorrelation of Teacher Characteristics and Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation of Teachers	101
XXII.	Regression Analysis Results Pertaining to the Relationship Between Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation and Selected Teacher Characteristics (I)	103

TABLE	PAGE
XXIII. Regression Analysis Results Pertaining to the Relationship Between Local-Cosmo- politan Role Orientation and Selected Teacher Characteristics (II)	105
XXIV. Regression Analysis Results Pertaining to the Relationship Between Local-Cosmo- politan Role Orientation and Selected Teacher Characteristics (III)	107
XXV. Intercorrelation of Teacher Characteristics and Teacher Descriptions or Perceptions of the Level of Bureaucratization	110
XXVI. Regression Analysis Results Pertaining to the Relationship Between Teachers' Perception of Bureaucracy and Selected Teacher Characteristics (I)	112
XXVII. Regression Analysis Results Pertaining to the Relationship Between Teachers' Perception of Bureaucracy and Selected Teacher Characteristics (II)	114
XXVIII. Regression Analysis Results Pertaining to the Relationship Between Teachers' Perception of Bureaucracy and Selected Teacher Characteristics (III)	115

TABLE	PAGE
XXIX. Intercorrelation of Teacher Characteristics and Teacher Satisfaction with the School Organization	118
XXX. Regression Analysis Results Pertaining to the Relationship Between Teachers' Satisfaction with the Organization and Selected Teacher Characteristics (I)	120
XXXI. Regression Analysis Results Pertaining to the Relationship Between Teachers' Satisfaction with the Organization and Selected Teacher Characteristics (II). . . .	122
XXXII. Regression Analysis Results Pertaining to the Relationship Between Teachers' Satisfaction with the Organization and Selected Teacher Characteristics (III) . . .	123

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Much has been written about the way in which organizations and their individual members interact with each other. In fact, if an organization is to achieve its goals, then it must influence individuals to behave differently as members of the organization than they do outside of the organization (4, pp. 4-5). Yet, it is obvious that members of organizations which have similar purposes, similar processes, and similar structural patterns, do not always behave in the same way. Organization control over members is not complete; moreover, the individual member may even exert some influence on the organization.

Research has shown that rationally conceived formal structures are modified by personality and attitudinal characteristics of members of the organization. It follows, therefore, that if we are to understand how organizations function, then we must understand not only the purposes, processes, and structural patterns, but we must also know something about the individual orientations and interpersonal relationships which determine, in part, the character of an organization.

Individuals may be classified in a number of ways for the purpose of analyzing the individual-organization

relationship. One possibility is a classification based upon role orientation which might be thought of as the constellation of attitudes that a person holds toward the performance of a particular task. A fruitful approach which has been used by a number of researchers, is to differentiate people according to local and cosmopolitan role orientation. Merton (5), and also Gouldner (3), for example, have used the terms local and cosmopolitan to distinguish people within the same environment who have differing role orientations.

Although there have been some attempts to apply these concepts in the study of school organizations, their utility has not been fully explored. The major purpose of this investigation was to carry out promising extensions of some of the previous work.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The general problem which was investigated in this study was whether teachers with differing orientations had differential perceptions of and satisfactions with the organizational structure of the schools in which they worked. This general problem was stated more specifically in the form of the following sub-problems:

- (1) Is a teacher's local-cosmopolitan orientation related to his perceptions of the organizational structure of the school?

- (2) Are there differences between locals and cosmopolitans in satisfaction with the organizational structure of schools?
- (3) Do locals and cosmopolitans express differential satisfaction with more highly structured and less highly structured school organizations?
- (4) Is the way in which principals react to teachers as members of the school organization related to teachers' local-cosmopolitan orientation?
- (5) Is local-cosmopolitan orientation of teachers related to various professional and personal characteristics?
- (6) Is perception of the organizational structure related to various professional and personal characteristics of teachers?
- (7) Is satisfaction with the school organization related to various professional and personal characteristics of teachers?

II. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Although a considerable amount of research has been reported on organizations, and also on the individual and various individual characteristics, there would appear to be far fewer attempts to study the interaction between

individual and organization. This would seem to be particularly true in regard to school organizations. In the words of Argyris:

. . . Organizations have some sort of formal structure within which individuals must work to achieve the organization's objectives. Each of these components of organization (the formal structure and the individuals) has been and continues to be the subject of much research, discussion and writing. An intensive search of the literature leads us to conclude, however, that most of these inquiries are conducted by persons typically interested in one or the other of the basic components. Few focus on both the individual and the organization (1, pp. 1-2).

Several researchers have, however, focussed on both the individual and the organization, and some, like Argyris, suggest that further research of this type would be useful. Specifically, Argyris suggests: "Since in real life the formal structure and individuals are continuously interacting and transacting, it seems useful to consider a study of their . . . impact upon each other" (1, p.2). Empirical studies of the interaction between organizational structures and the individual members should increase our understanding of organizations in process, and therefore constitute an avenue for fruitful research. This would be particularly useful in increasing understandings of and extending avenues of research into the operation of schools and school systems.

Perhaps the most significant attitudinal factors which relate to the interaction between organization and member are the individual's views of his work and of the

organization which employs him. These attitudes are part of the conceptualization of local-cosmopolitan role orientations. Support for the value of analyzing local and cosmopolitan orientation is provided by Gouldner when he states: "The analysis of cosmopolitan and local latent roles has, we believe, considerable relevance for substantive theories of organizational analysis and bureaucratic systems" (3, pp. 463-64). In addition, he suggests that the manner in which the orientations of the individuals shape organizational behavior requires more attention. The study of local-cosmopolitan identities and roles within organizations may also prove to be fruitful because it is one way of approaching the problem of organizational tension (2, p. 399).

Sutthoff, who made a study of citizen participation in school affairs, supports the application of these concepts in educational research:

The local-cosmopolitan orientation may have implications also for the analysis of organizational problems within the school. Research in the area of local-cosmopolitan orientations of teachers and administrators could contribute to better understanding of staff relations (7, p. 4).

Such factors as conflict, satisfaction with the organization, and confidence in leadership may be closely related to differences in orientation of teachers; therefore, research in this area should have both theoretical and

practical value for teachers and administrators. Knowledge of the relationship between variables such as local-cosmopolitan orientation and various personal and professional characteristics not only serves to clarify the variables but also suggests possibilities for identifying problem areas significant in administrative practice.

III. DELIMITATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND ASSUMPTIONS

Delimitations

The relationship between an organization and its members is a two-way process: the orientation of the members to the organization, and the orientation of the organization to its members. This study was delimited to an investigation of the organizational structure of schools and the way in which the organization was perceived by the teachers within these schools. Furthermore, from among a number of possibilities the orientation of teachers was delimited to local-cosmopolitan role orientation.

An additional delimitation of the study was that it included only central Alberta schools which during the 1966-67 school year enrolled grades one to eleven or one to twelve, and which were identified by their superintendents as being either high or low in bureaucratic characteristics when compared with the other schools in the system.

Limitations

The assumptions stated below suggest certain limitations of the study. Other limitations are as follows:

- (1) Local-cosmopolitan role orientation represents only one facet of the total concept an individual has of his role. The present study did not attempt to ascertain other orientations, such as the professional role orientation, that an individual may have.
- (2) The reliability and validity of instruments developed for use in this particular study have not been established beyond the limits of this study.
- (3) Lack of representativeness of the sample limits the extent to which generalizations which are drawn from this study may be applied to similar school organizations elsewhere.

Assumptions

One of the basic assumptions of this type of study is drawn from Parsons (6) namely, that the individual and the organization are not separable, but interact with one another. Thus it was assumed that personality is influenced by the organization and that the organization is influenced by the personalities of its members. From this assumption

it follows that an individual's perceptions of and satisfaction with an organization are the resultant of the transactions between the individual and the organization.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF THESIS

This chapter presented an introduction to the study, the statement of the problem to be investigated, a statement of the significance of the problem, and the delimitations, limitations, and assumptions of the study. Ensuing chapters will present the conceptual framework and related research, a statement of the hypotheses to be tested, the research procedures, and results of the analysis of the data. The conclusions and implications drawn from the results are presented in the final chapter.

References are presented at the end of each chapter. The bibliography is compiled at the end of the final chapter and is followed by appendices which include the instruments and scales used.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER I

- (1) Argyris, Chris. "The Individual and Organization: Some Problems of Mutual Adjustment," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:1-24, June, 1957.
- (2) Bennis, W. G., K. D. Benne, and R. Chin. The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- (3) Gouldner, A. W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:281-306, December, 1957; 2:444-486, March, 1958.
- (4) Kahn, H. L. et al. Organizational Stress. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- (5) Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949.
- (6) Parsons, T. "Social Structure and the Development of Personality Trends: Construction to the Integration of Psychology and Sociology," Psychiatry, 21:321-340, November, 1958.
- (7) Sutthoff, John. "Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation and Participation in School Affairs," Administrator's Notebook, 9, November, 1960.

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter presents (1) discussions of local-cosmopolitan role orientation, (2) the bureaucratic structure of organizations, (3) definitions of terms, and (4) a statement of hypotheses. Reference is made to relevant research where such research has been reported.

I. LOCAL-COSMOPOLITAN ROLE ORIENTATION

Various studies have been made which concern themselves with an individual's role orientation. One study concluded, after extensive research, that orientation is merely another term applied to the familiar idea that a person's beliefs are shaped by the groups of people with whom he identifies (17, p. 563). Some individuals are influenced more by persons in their immediate work environment; others seem to have beliefs more similar to those of a larger occupational group. These tendencies lie at the basis of the distinction between a local and a cosmopolitan orientation. Even professional employees may be strongly oriented either toward the organization in which they work or toward the profession in general.

In identifying two types of influentials, Merton was influenced by Tönnie's distinction between Gemeinschaft

and Gessellschaft. A similar distinction has been carried through the writings of Cooley, Simmel, and Durkheim, although the terminology differs (12, p. 393).

Specific reference to the distinction between locals and cosmopolitans was made by Merton in his study of influentials in the town of Rovere; influentials were divided into locals and cosmopolitans on the basis of their orientation toward Rovere (12). The local confined his interests to the community, was preoccupied with local problems to the exclusion of the national and the international scene; he was, according to Merton, a "parochial" (12, p. 393). The cosmopolitan influential also had some interest in the local community; however, his orientation was to the world outside of Rovere. He regarded himself as an integral part of the world, not just of the local community, and according to Merton was an "ecumenical" (12, p. 393).

Other writers have used similar distinctions but have not always used the actual terms "local" and "cosmopolitan". Turner (19) for example, attempted to show a relationship between various types of values and the group to which a person was oriented. Reissman distinguished four types of orientation groups which he called functional bureaucrat, job bureaucrat, specialist bureaucrat, and service bureaucrat, and made use of these concepts in order

to point out areas of conflict (16, p. 118). Marvick, as cited in Kornhauser (10) distinguished three types of orientation in his study of a military research agency. He talked about "specialist orientation", "institutional orientation", and "hybrid orientation"; these might also be called skillbound, placebound, and opportunistic types of orientation.

Lazarsfeld and Thielens described college teachers as having two kinds of orientation; those who placed emphasis upon recognition by their professional peers, either on the campus or all over the country, and those who placed emphasis upon approval by the college administration. One of the conclusions of the study was that a large proportion of college teachers were of the former or "cosmopolitan" type, while a much smaller proportion were of the latter or "local" type (1).

In the study of an industrial plant, Gouldner found differences between locals and cosmopolitans in terms of degrees of influence, participation, propensity to accept or reject organizational ruling and informal relations (6, 7). He also used local and cosmopolitan orientation to distinguish staff members in a case study of a college (7). Results of the study included a number of interesting findings: extreme locals tended to participate more in community activities than did extreme cosmopolitans, but

intermediate groups between the two extremes participated most of all; locals tended to have a higher ratio of sociability than did cosmopolitans (7).

There has been some tendency in the literature on personal orientation and social structures for writers to argue for the differential significance of only one type of orientation for a given social structure. It is theorized, for example, that in a professional organization the members will be cosmopolitan oriented. This, however, in the opinion of Kornhauser, ignores two obvious facts: first that there are multiple functions in any complex social system, and therefore, secondly there will be more than one type of orientation in such a system (10, pp. 121-22).

Sutthoff used the local-cosmopolitan dichotomy in his study of participatory behavior in school affairs of over three hundred P.T.A. members. He found that locals and cosmopolitans differed in both the form of participation and the degree to which they participated in school matters. Cosmopolitans were psychologically closer to their schools and exhibited more interest in school affairs; they had read more and talked more than had locals about school issues and problems (18).

Brumbaugh studied local-cosmopolitan orientation and teacher attitudes toward reorganization of school

district boundaries. He concluded that "frequently the differing perceptions of individuals to the same environment can be attributed to local or cosmopolitan . . . orientation" (3).

The distinction between locals and cosmopolitans may help to explain the differences in teachers' perceptions of organizational structure. The cosmopolitan might be classed as the professional expert who believes that his expertness is validated by the profession to which he belongs. He tends to have largely internalized the professional norms as set by professional groups beyond the local community; he tends to be committed to his professional skills and may be low on loyalty to the organization. The local, on the other hand, tends to be loyal to the organization and to have internalized its norms; he is likely to be low on commitment to the profession. Teachers who are cosmopolitans, and therefore likely to be committed to professional skills, might be expected to be more dissatisfied with highly bureaucratic school organizations than are teachers who are locals.

Rational approaches to organizational design have tended to assume that the more expert were the personnel of the organization, the more efficient would be the organization. But those who are expert are also likely to be cosmopolitan in outlook and less loyal to their employing

organizations. This is at the basis of Merton's speculation that there would "appear to be some tension between an organization's bureaucratic needs for expertise and its social systems need for loyalty" (12, p. 466).

Several of the hypotheses in this study are based on the assumption that cosmopolitans will tend to be more satisfied with an organization which has fewer procedural restrictions. Cosmopolitans are likely to be oriented to an outer professional reference group and will therefore tend to pursue goals and use means which are not entirely accepted by a particular organization. Locals, on the other hand, are likely to be more in favor of a formal structure which provides an explicit framework for their behavior. As a result, locals may be more satisfied than cosmopolitans within a clearly-delineated and prescriptive formal structure.

II. BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATIONS

The sociological study of formal organizations in terms of the bureaucratic model stems from the work of Max Weber (8). As an ideal type, bureaucratic organizations were conceived, from the formal technical point of view, as being the most rational type of organization.

Blau has summarized, from the translated writings of Weber, (5, 21) the main characteristics of bureaucratic

organizations. These are as follows:

1. "The regular activities required for the purposes of the organization are distributed in a fixed way as official duties." The clear-cut division of labor makes it possible to employ only specialized experts in each particular position and to make every one of them responsible for the effective performance of his duties . . .
2. "The organization of offices follows the principle of hierarchy; that is, each office is under the control and supervision of a higher one." Every official in this administrative hierarchy is accountable to his superior for his subordinates' decisions and actions as well as his own . . .
3. Operations are governed "by a consistent system of abstract rules . . . (and) consist of the application of these rules to particular cases." This system of standards is designed to assure uniformity in the performance of every task . . .
4. "The ideal official conducts his office . . . (in) a spirit of formalistic impersonality, "Sine ira et studio", without hatred or passion, and hence without affection or enthusiasm." For rational standards to govern operations without interference from personal considerations, a detached approach must prevail within the organization and especially toward clients . . .
5. Employment in the bureaucratic organization is based on technical qualifications and is protected against arbitrary dismissal. "It constitutes a career. There is a system of 'promotions' according to seniority or to achievement or both." These personnel policies . . . encourage the development of loyalty to the organization and esprit de corps among its members . . .
6. "Experience tends universally to show that the purely bureaucratic type of administrative organization . . . is, from a purely technical point of view, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency." "The fully developed bureaucratic mechanism compares with other organizations exactly as does the machine with the non-mechanical modes of production." Bureaucracy solves the distinctive organizational problem of maximizing organizational efficiency . . . (1, pp. 29-31).

The presence of some or all of these characteristics in the organizational structure of schools raised the question of conflict and compatability with professional orientation of people who work within such organizations. Teachers may be classed as professionals or at least semi-professionals because they satisfy some frequently accepted criteria such as specialized preparation and so forth, requiring some years of training beyond high school. It has been observed that some characteristics of professions are similar to bureaucratic ones, but that others differ. According to Blau, one main difference is that professions have a distinctive control structure which is fundamentally different from the hierarchical control structure of bureaucratic organizations. He states that the source of discipline within a bureaucracy is the hierarchy of authority, while in a profession it is the colleague group. Performance in bureaucratic organizations is thus controlled by directions received from one's superiors rather than by self-imposed standards and peer-group surveillance, as is the case among professionals (2).

In view of what has been stated above, there is doubt whether persons with a marked professional orientation are as satisfied in a bureaucratic setting as are those who do not hold such an orientation. Washbourne found that teachers with more training were more unfavorable

towards bureaucratic controls (20). This would seem to indicate that as teachers obtain more training and perhaps become more professional in their outlook, they become more dissatisfied in schools which show a higher degree of bureaucratization. Similarly, Peabody found that teachers rely less on authority of position than do those occupational groups which require less training. This suggests that there is a greater need for autonomy and reliance on internalized standards within the more professional group (14).

In a recent study of school systems, Moeller found that teachers expressed greater sense of power to influence policy in the more bureaucratic systems. He interpreted this to mean that the teachers in a more bureaucratic system felt a greater sense of power because they knew the rules and were better able to predict what was required of them than was the case in a less bureaucratic system (13). Perhaps the Presthus explanation that their role perceptions were improved, and so were the chances of reducing anxiety by complying with the requirements of the organization holds true in this case (15).

There seems to be some indication from Moeller's findings that satisfaction with the school organization may be greater as the degree of bureaucratization increases, at least up to a point (13). Further empirical evidence

would seem to be needed to clear up any differences of interpretation in this matter.

In a study completed in 1964, Hartley (9) related teachers' perceptions of a number of selected criterion variables to teachers' perceptions of the degree of bureaucratization of schools and local-cosmopolitan role orientation. Hartley found that teachers differed in their perceptions of the organizational structure, and that the way in which the teachers perceived the organizational structure of school could not be used as a predictor of their satisfaction with this type of organization. Among other findings, Hartley concluded that cosmopolitans were more satisfied with their schools than were locals.

The study described in this report was similar to Hartley's in that it also relates the degree of school bureaucratization and local-cosmopolitan role orientation to a number of variables including teacher satisfaction. The study differed from Hartley's in that it made use of outside judges rather than of teachers within the schools to establish the degree of school bureaucratization. Also the local-cosmopolitan instrument used was a different type of instrument from the one used by Hartley; furthermore, satisfaction as measured here is not satisfaction in the teacher situation, but satisfaction with the degree of bureaucracy in the schools. Hartley used high schools only

for his sample, (9) whereas this study included only schools with grades one to eleven or grades one to twelve. The study by Hartley and the present study represent complementary analyses of the variables under investigation.

III. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following are definition of selected terms used in the study and in this report.

Cosmopolitans. Those teachers who tend to be more highly committed to the profession of teaching, rather than to the school as an organization tend to have a cosmopolitan orientation. Teachers who are classed as cosmopolitan are more likely to be committed to the professional groups beyond the local community and will be more likely to choose advancement in their profession over advancement in the school even if it means moving away from the local school and community.

Locals. Those teachers who tend to be more highly committed to the employing school organization, rather than to the profession of teaching tend to have a local orientation. Teachers who are classed as locals are more likely to be dedicated and loyal to the school and its community, and will be more likely to turn down professional advancement so that they may remain in the local school and community.

Bureaucracy. The term bureaucracy is used to refer to the administrative aspects of organizations such as the hierarchy of authority, emphasis on policies, expertise, formality, and impersonality. In this study schools were categorized by means of the School Bureaucracy Inventory as either low bureaucratic or high bureaucratic. High bureaucratic schools are characterized by general emphasis on these organizational features; low bureaucratic schools are those in which bureaucratic characteristics are not emphasized to as great an extent.

Satisfaction. Satisfaction is conceived as the feeling or attitude that teachers hold towards the degree of bureaucratization of the school. In the study teachers indicated the extent to which they were satisfied with various organizational characteristics.

IV. STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

The professions, which have long been typified by the independent practitioner, appear to be undergoing a period of transition. During recent years a large number of members of professions, such as physicians and lawyers have become salaried employees in organizations; members of emerging professional groups such as social workers, nurses, and teachers are almost exclusively employees.

This transition of status from independent practitioner to salaried employee, has created problems which the bureaucratized professionals have attempted to solve in different ways. Some have attempted to retain their identification with a professional group; these may be classed as having a cosmopolitan orientation. Others tend to have less commitment to their profession and colleagues, and identify instead with the particular organization by which they are employed; these may be classed as having a local orientation.

There would appear to be several possibilities for conflict between the professional person and the employing organization. Caplow and McGee, in a study of the process of recruitment in a sample of universities, provide a specific example of this conflict when they state that:

Today, a scholar's orientation to his institution is apt to disorient him to his discipline and to affect his professional prestige unfavorably. Conversely, an orientation to his discipline will disorient him to his institution . . . (4, p. 85).

Similarly, in a study of intellectuals in labor unions, Wilensky found that skilled workers in one category were concerned mainly with finding positions where these skills could be used to advantage, and were willing to consider any moves that would enhance this possibility. Those workers in another category were far less willing to consider such moves (22, pp. 129-144).

It would appear from the foregoing paragraphs that an individual's local-cosmopolitan role orientation, his perception of and satisfaction with the organization by which he is employed, and the structural characteristics of this organization are interrelated. The sub-problems which were designed to investigate this interrelationship in the present study are presented below together with the associated hypotheses.

Sub-Problem 1

The first sub-problem is concerned with the perceptions which teachers have of schools as organizations. It might be anticipated that teachers generally have reasonably accurate perceptions of the organizational structure of the schools in which they teach. Therefore, it was hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1. Teacher descriptions of the level of bureaucratization is related to the organizational characteristics of the school; teachers perceive higher levels of bureaucracy in schools classed as high bureaucratic and lower levels of bureaucracy in schools classed as low bureaucratic.

Additional factors need to be taken into account in analyzing the above relationships. The local, who is more dedicated and loyal to the organization than the cosmopolitan is so involved with and committed to organizational affairs that he may not be as highly aware of structural characteristics as is the cosmopolitan. Therefore, it was hypothe-

sized further that:

Hypothesis 2. Teacher descriptions of the level of bureaucracy is related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation; those who tend to have a local orientation perceive less bureaucratization than those who tend to have a cosmopolitan orientation.

Sub-Problem 2

The second sub-problem is concerned with teachers' satisfaction with the school organization. As members of occupational groups acquire more training, and presumably become more professional in their outlook, they may become dissatisfied in organizations with a high degree of bureaucratization. Therefore it was hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 3. Teachers, in general, are significantly more satisfied with low bureaucratic schools than with high bureaucratic schools.

Since by definition locals are more likely to conform to and be more satisfied with the demands of the organization than are cosmopolitans, it was hypothesized further that:

Hypothesis 4. Teachers classed as locals are significantly more satisfied with the school organizational characteristics than teachers who are classed as cosmopolitans.

Sub-Problem 3

The orientation of a teacher may have a bearing on degree of satisfaction with organizational structure. Cosmopolitans might be more satisfied to work with fewer organizational restrictions so that they might better

pursue their professional goals. Locals, on the other hand, might prefer a clear-cut formal structure with which to identify. Therefore, it was hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 5. Teacher satisfaction with the type of school organization is related to both local-cosmopolitan role orientation and degree of bureaucratization; locals tend to be more satisfied with high bureaucratic schools, while cosmopolitans tend to be more satisfied with low bureaucratic schools.

Sub-Problem 4

This sub-problem deals with the reactions to and descriptions of teachers with differing local-cosmopolitan orientations.

Since locals are by definition more loyal and dedicated to the organization, it is assumed that the organization and its administrators will consequently react more favorably to locals than they do to cosmopolitans. It was therefore hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 6. Principals perceive teachers classed as locals as being significantly (1) more willing to undertake unexpected duties, (2) more likely to warrant promotion, (3) more trustworthy, (4) more likely to be elected to local Alberta Teachers' Association executive positions, and (5) more likely to be invited to social gatherings by principals than teachers classed as cosmopolitans.

Sub-Problem 5

This sub-problem deals with the relation between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and selected personal and professional characteristics of teachers, namely: age;

number of years of academic and professional training; years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in same school; number of systems in which the teacher has taught; the average number of clock hours per week devoted to the teaching job; sex of teacher; marital status; grade level assignment; whether the teacher attended school in the district in which he is teaching; and the degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career. A number of researchers have described various characteristics of locals and cosmopolitans. Merton, for example, described locals as being likely to have lived in the community for a long time, and as being older and with less formal education than cosmopolitans (12, pp. 394-402). Locals and cosmopolitans in the present study were compared to determine whether similar differences might be observed. It was hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 7. Local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers is related to personal and professional characteristics of teachers.

Sub-Problem 6

Sub-problem number six deals with the relation between teachers' perception of the organizational structure of schools and the same personal and professional characteristics. It was hypothesized as follows:

Hypothesis 8. Teacher descriptions of the level of bureaucratization is related to personal and professional characteristics of teachers.

Sub-Problem 7

The final sub-problem deals with the relation between teachers' satisfaction with the school organization and the same personal and professional characteristics. It was hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 9. Teachers' satisfaction with the school organization is related to personal and professional characteristics of teachers.

V. SUMMARY

This chapter has presented the conceptual framework for the study, a discussion of local-cosmopolitan role orientation, a discussion of bureaucratic characteristics, definitions of terms used in the study, and a statement of specific hypotheses to be tested. Certain of the hypotheses dealt with the relationships between local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers and their descriptions of and satisfaction with high and low bureaucratic schools. Other hypotheses related administrator reactions to teachers, to local-cosmopolitan role orientation of the teachers. The last set of hypotheses dealt with various teacher characteristics in relation to local-cosmopolitan role orientation, and descriptions of and satisfaction with the organization. In the chapter which follows, the research procedures and instruments used in the study are described.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER II

- (1) Blau, P. M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1964.
- (2) ———, and W. R. Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- (3) Brumbaugh, R. B. "Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation and Teacher Attitudes Toward Reorganization," Administrator's Notebook, 12, March, 1964.
- (4) Caplow, T. and R. J. McGee. The Academic Marketplace. New York: Basic Books, 1958.
- (5) Gerth, W. W. and C. Wright Mills. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- (6) Gouldner, A. W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Role," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:281-306, December, 1957; 2:444-486, March, 1958.
- (7) ———. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: The Free Press, 1954.
- (8) Harris, C. M. and M. R. Libs (eds.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Third edition. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960. pp. 1481-1486.
- (9) Hartley, H. J. "Bureaucracy and Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation Examined with Selected Criterion Variables." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1964.
- (10) Kornhauser, W. Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.
- (11) Lazarsfeld, P. T. and W. Thielens, Jr. The Academic Mind. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958.
- (12) Merton, R. M. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949.
- (13) Moeller, G. M. "Bureaucracy, and Teachers' Sense of Power," Administrator's Notebook, 11, November, 1962.

- (14) Peabody, R. L. "Perceptions of Occupational Authority - A Comparative Analysis," Administrative Science Quarterly, 6, June, 1961.
- (15) Presthus, R. V. "Weberian vs Welfare Bureaucracy in Traditional Society," Administrative Science Quarterly, 6:6-24, June, 1961.
- (16) Reissman, L. "A Study of Role Conceptions in Bureaucracy," Social Forces, 27:305-310, 1949, as in W. Kornhauser, Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.
- (17) Shibutani, T. "Reference Groups as Perspectives," American Journal of Sociology, 60, March, 1955.
- (18) Sutthoff, John. "Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation and Participation in School Affairs," Administrator's Notebook, 9, November, 1960.
- (19) Turner, R. N. "Role-Taking, Role Standpoint and Reference Group Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, 61, January, 1956.
- (20) Washbourne, C. "The Teacher in the Authority System," Journal of Educational Sociology, 30:390-394, May, 1957.
- (21) Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by A. N. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- (22) Wilensky, H. L. Intellectuals in Labor Unions. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The preceding chapter contains an examination of a number of considerations related to role orientation of teachers, structural organization of schools, and teachers' differential descriptions of and satisfaction with the structure. Hypotheses relating to these factors were formulated. It is the purpose of the present chapter to report the research design used in testing these hypotheses, and to explicate the specific procedures employed in carrying out the study.

I. METHOD OF COLLECTION OF DATA

The sample of schools for this study were included in the school systems from one geographical region of central Alberta. The superintendents of schools in each of eleven systems were asked to use the School Bureaucracy Inventory (Appendix C) to rate two schools--one considered to be high bureaucratic school and one considered to be low bureaucratic school--in their particular school systems. Provision was made in planning to omit any schools without consensus as to level of bureaucratization, or ones in which the rater did not have a high confidence in his rating. (See Appendix C, Part II). Provision was also made for the

addition of other schools and school systems in the event that the total number of school systems should fall below a minimum of six, and the number of schools fall below a minimum of twelve. Only schools including grades one to eleven or grades one to twelve were included in this study.

The teacher sample included all of the teachers, excluding the principal, in each of the schools selected. Each teacher received a questionnaire consisting of the following instruments: an instrument to measure local-cosmopolitan orientation; an instrument to measure degree of bureaucratization as perceived by teachers; an instrument to measure the degree of satisfaction with the school organization; and a number of multiple response questions to obtain data on certain selected teacher characteristics. Instruments are included in Appendix D.

II. THE MEASURE OF LOCAL-COSMOPOLITAN ROLE ORIENTATION

A search of the literature revealed that several instruments have been used for measuring local-cosmopolitan role orientation, but that none of these appeared suitable for the present study. An instrument designed to differentiate between locals and cosmopolitans was therefore constructed after a careful study of previously used methods.

A number of researchers measured local-cosmopolitan role orientation by using questionnaires consisting of

open-ended questions or by using an interview (3, 7). Several other researchers constructed instruments by which to measure local-cosmopolitan role orientation, (9, 6) but these instruments were not validated, nor was there any evidence to show that they might be reliable measures. Another reason for not using these instruments was that they did not measure role orientation independently from perception of the organization as required by the present study.

Sutthoff (10) devised an instrument for discriminating between locals and cosmopolitans which he used in his study of participatory behavior of P.T.A. members in regard to school affairs. Brumbaugh (2) and Hartley (4) adapted this instrument to apply to teachers, by altering the wording of items.

Initially, use of this instrument was contemplated for the present study; however the scale had several disadvantages which led to an alternate decision. First, the scale included only three items, and there was some concern that these three items might not adequately discriminate between locals and cosmopolitans. Secondly, it was decided that an attempt should be made in the present study to place local-cosmopolitan role orientation on a continuum from local to cosmopolitan, rather than merely to treat the characteristic as being dichotomous.

The Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation (see Appendix D, Part I) used in the present study originally consisted of nineteen items (see Appendix A, Section I, Part I) offering local and cosmopolitan alternatives by which teachers might describe themselves. The first alternative, alternative A in each question, was characteristic of a local, and the second alternative, or alternative B in each question, was characteristic of a cosmopolitan, except in questions numbered 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 17, where the reverse was the case.

Two typical questions from the scale are:

Question 4: "Do you think that all teachers should try to take an active interest in community affairs?
(a) Yes, they should. (b) No, not unless they so desire."

Question 5: "Do you belong to any voluntary educational organizations such as Specialist Councils of the A.T.A., etc.?
(a) Yes. (b) No."

A value of 0 for the local alternative and 1 for the cosmopolitan alternative was assigned to each question. The lowest possible total score of 0 therefore represented the most local, and the highest possible score of 19 represented the most cosmopolitan score possible.

Pilot Study I

A pilot study was conducted to ascertain whether the Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation (Appendix A, Section I, Part I) effectively distinguished among teachers with varying degrees of local and cosmopolitan role orientation.

The teaching staff of the five public schools of one Alberta town school district were asked to complete the teacher questionnaire (Appendix A, Section I) and their principals were asked to place the teachers on a six-point scale on a continuum from most local to most cosmopolitan (Appendix A, Section III). The Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation (Appendix A, Section II) was given again two weeks later to the same teachers.

Of the fifty-four teachers who were asked to complete the questionnaire, forty-nine completed both sections and were rated by their principals. The individual item-total score correlation as can be seen in Table I reveals that two items showed a negative correlation with the total score and were not retained. One other item was eliminated because all respondents but one gave the same response. The correlation between the revised sixteen-item scale (Appendix D, Part I) and the principals' rating was .75 which is significant at the .01 level. A retest reliability

TABLE I

ITEM-TOTAL SCORE CORRELATION ON LOCAL-
COSMOPOLITAN ROLE ORIENTATION SCALE AS
DETERMINED BY PILOT STUDY NUMBER I

Item	Correlation
1	.3993
2	.4478
3	.3830
4	.1079
5*	.1189
6	.3579
7	.2003
8	.2244
9*	-.0782
10	.3456
11	.3113
12	.4953
13	.2023
14	.3529
15	.5671
16	.5346
17	.2068
18	.4279
19*	-.2196

* These items omitted from revised sixteen-item scale.

coefficient calculated for the revised sixteen-item scale was .84. This would appear to indicate that the responses to the instrument were reasonably consistent over the two test situations.

The revised sixteen-item Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation (Appendix D, Part I)

is the one used in the main study. As before, the first alternative, alternative A in each question, characterizes a local orientation and the second alternative, or alternative B in each question, characterizes a cosmopolitan orientation, except in questions numbered 7, 10, 11, and 15 where the reverse is the case.

At the same time that the teachers were asked to complete the Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation in the pilot study, they were also asked to complete and comment on the items on the other parts of the Teacher Questionnaire--namely the Instrument to Measure Teachers' Perception of the Degree of Bureaucracy of Schools (Appendix A, Section I, Part II), the Instrument to Measure Teachers' Degree of Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction with the School Organization (Appendix A, Section I, Part III); and the Teacher Characteristics Questionnaire (Appendix A, Section I, Part IV).

As a result of the comments made by the respondents, certain changes in the wording of some of the items were made and a new set of instruments: the Instrument to Measure Teachers' Perception of the Degree of Bureaucracy of Schools (Appendix D, Part II); the Instrument to Measure Teachers' Degree of Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction with the School Organization (Appendix D, Part III); and the Teacher Characteristics Questionnaire (Appendix D, Part IV) were constructed and used in the main study.

III. THE SCHOOL BUREAUCRACY INVENTORY

A search of the literature revealed that a number of different instruments had been used to measure the degree of bureaucratization of educational organizations. Instruments used by MacKay (5) and Hartley (4) depended upon teachers' perceptions of organizational characteristics as the measure of the degree of bureaucratization of their schools. Since teachers' perceptions might be influenced by the individual's role orientation and other individual characteristics of teachers such as those measured in this study, a different method of differentiating between high bureaucratic and low bureaucratic schools was therefore considered to be necessary for the present study.

Moeller (8) constructed an eight-item, forced-choice instrument based on Weber's bureaucratic characteristics as described by Blau. He administered this instrument to a group of judges who possessed some first-hand knowledge of the school systems in question, and these judgments became the basis for rating school systems according to their degree of bureaucratization.

Since Moeller was concerned with school systems rather than schools, his instrument for measuring bureaucracy was not applicable to the present study. Therefore, an instrument similar to Moeller's was constructed for use

in the present study. (See School Bureaucracy Inventory or Instrument to Measure Degree of Bureaucracy, Appendix B).

The writings on bureaucracy as summarized by Blau (1) and cited in the preceding chapter served as the basis for constructing an instrument to differentiate among schools selected for study. Twelve items were developed offering alternatives which judges could select to describe schools as high bureaucratic or low bureaucratic. The items were formulated in as objective a way as possible, and an attempt was made to make alternatives which were equally attractive.

The first alternative in each of the even-numbered questions, and the second alternative in each of the odd-numbered questions signifies the presence of bureaucratic characteristics to a high degree.

Judges were asked to rate schools on the basis of being "somewhat like" or "much like" one of the two alternatives. A score of 5 was assigned for each question in which the judge stated that the school being rated was much like the high bureaucratic alternative, and a score of 4 if it was somewhat like this alternative. A score of 2 was assigned if the school was somewhat like the low bureaucratic alternative and a score of 1 if it was much like this alternative. For any question on which the judge could not make up his mind between the high bureaucratic or

low bureaucratic alternatives, a score of 3 was assigned. The total possible scores therefore ranged from a low of 12 as the low bureaucracy extreme, to 60 as the high bureaucracy extreme.

Teachers were asked to rate their schools on a similar instrument. (See Appendix D, Part II). The ratings were made in the same fashion, but what was measured in this case was the teachers' descriptions of the degree of bureaucratization of schools.

Pilot Study II

A number of school superintendents and graduate university students familiar with the concept of bureaucracy were asked to choose one school with which they were familiar which they believed to be low and one which they believed to be high in degree of bureaucratization. They then used the School Bureaucracy Inventory (Appendix B) to rate these schools to help determine whether the instrument actually measured degree of bureaucratization as perceived by the superintendents and graduate students in question. The superintendents and graduate university students were also asked to comment on the School Bureaucracy Inventory.

Table II shows the ratings assigned to the high bureaucratic schools on the individual test items, while

TABLE II

SCORES OF SCHOOLS CONSIDERED TO BE HIGH BUREAUCRATIC
ON SCHOOL BUREAUCRACY INVENTORY
BY ITEM
(Appendix B)

Item Number	School Number																		Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
1	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	3	5	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	79
2	4	5	5	5	5	1	5	5	1	5	5	2	5	3	5	4	4	4	73
3	5	1	5	1	5	2	5	3	5	5	2	2	5	3	5	4	5	4	67
4	5	5	5	4	5	2	5	5	1	5	4	3	5	3	5	4	4	4	74
5	4	5	5	2	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	80
6	4	5	4	3	5	4	4	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	72
7	5	5	5	1	5	3	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	2	2	4	4	72
8	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	3	4	4	3	4	1	2	4	4	72
9	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	3	5	2	3	5	4	5	4	4	4	75
10	4	5	2	5	3	1	3	3	1	5	3	3	5	4	4	4	2	3	60
11	5	4	5	2	5	4	4	5	1	3	4	5	5	5	5	2	5	4	75
12	5	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	77
Totals	54	54	55	40	58	41	52	52	39	54	46	42	53	46	49	43	49	49	876

Table III shows the ratings assigned to the low bureaucratic schools on these individual test items. The range of total scores on the high bureaucratic schools is from 39 to 58 with a mean total score of 48.67. The range of total scores on the low bureaucratic schools is from 14 to 36 with a mean total score of 25.67.

On the basis of the eighteen sets of School Bureaucracy Inventories which were completed and returned, it was judged that one question, question 10, relating to the presence or absence of a feeling of esprit de corps among the staff members in the school, did not discriminate between high and low bureaucratic schools. The wording of this question was therefore changed. Question number 5, relating to whether procedures were developed to suit individual problems as they arose, rather than being explicitly stated beforehand in formal policy, or whether decisions tended to be made by administrators on the basis of established, written school policies, seemed especially useful for discriminating between high bureaucratic and low bureaucratic schools. (See Table II and Table III). As a result of Pilot Study II a revised Inventory (see Appendix C) was constructed and used in the main study. The number of items and scores assigned to each remained as stated above for the original Inventory (Appendix B).

TABLE III

SCORES OF SCHOOLS CONSIDERED TO BE LOW BUREAUCRATIC
ON SCHOOL BUREAUCRACY INVENTORY
BY ITEM
(Appendix B)

Item Number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	Totals
1	2	4	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	4	2	1	2	1	2	2	3	36
2	2	4	4	4	1	5	2	3	1	1	4	4	1	3	1	4	1	3	48
3	2	4	5	2	1	2	2	3	1	1	5	5	1	2	1	4	2	2	45
4	2	1	4	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	31
5	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	26
6	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	1	2	1	4	2	2	1	33
7	1	4	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	4	1	2	3	32
8	1	2	2	5	1	2	2	2	5	1	2	3	1	2	5	2	2	3	43
9	2	5	4	5	1	2	2	2	3	1	4	3	1	2	1	4	1	3	46
10	2	4	5	5	3	5	3	2	4	1	5	3	1	1	2	5	4	3	58
11	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	30
12	1	4	4	1	1	4	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	34
Totals	20	36	36	32	14	27	23	27	23	23	34	27	18	19	23	30	22	28	462

IV. THE MEASURE OF SATISFACTION WITH THE ORGANIZATION

The instrument used to measure teachers' satisfaction with the organization of the school (see Appendix A, Section I, Part III) was based on the same factors as the School Bureaucracy Inventory. As a result of the first pilot study described above, some slight changes were made in the instrument and a revised Instrument to Measure Degree of Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction with the School Organization (Appendix D, Part III) was constructed. Teachers rated their school on a continuum from 1 to 5 on each of the twelve items. This rating was based on the individual teacher's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the type of organization which the teacher believed existed in the school in which he taught. This score on each item was as follows: a score of 1 for very dissatisfied, 2 for dissatisfied, 3 for undecided, 4 for satisfied, and 5 for very satisfied. The scores were then totalled for all twelve items. The range of total ratings was from 12 (most dissatisfied) to 60 (most satisfied).

V. TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

An eleven-item questionnaire was included to determine a number of selected individual characteristics

of teachers such as age, and marital status, and situational characteristics such as the grade level assignment. (See Teacher Characteristics, Appendix D, Part IV).

VI. SUMMARY

The present chapter has outlined the method of collection of data and described the data-collecting instruments used, namely the measure of local-cosmopolitan role orientation, the school bureaucracy inventory, the measure of satisfaction with the organization, and the questionnaire regarding teacher characteristics. Also included in the chapter was a report on the pilot studies which were carried out in the development of the instruments. The next chapter will describe the research design.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER III

- (1) Blau, P. M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1964.
- (2) Brumbaugh, R. B. "Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation and Teacher Attitudes Toward Reorganization," Administrator's Notebook, 12, March, 1964.
- (3) Coleman, J. et al. "The Diffusion of an Innovation," Sociometry, 20:253-270, 1957.
- (4) Hartley, H. J. "Bureaucracy and Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation Examined with Selected Criterion Variables." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1964.
- (5) MacKay, D. A. "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relation to Other Characteristics of School Organization." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.
- (6) Marion, G. B. "A Study of Selected Factors Related to the Innovativeness of Elementary School Principals." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.
- (7) Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949.
- (8) Moeller, G. H. "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power," Administrator's Notebook, 11, November, 1962.
- (9) Rogers, E. M. Diffusion of Innovations. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- (10) Sutthoff, John. "Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation and Participation in School Affairs," Administrator's Notebook, 9, November, 1960.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH DESIGN

I. THE SAMPLE

As was stated in the previous chapter, eleven school systems were selected in the initial phase of the present study. The superintendents of these school systems were sent questionnaires asking for permission to conduct the study in their areas, and also School Bureaucracy Inventories (Appendix C) by which they were to rate their schools from most bureaucratic to least bureaucratic. Only schools which included grades one to eleven, or grades one to twelve were considered, and only the school rated by the superintendent to be the most bureaucratic and the one rated least bureaucratic in each school division or county was included in the study.

It had been expected that an independent judge, for example the provincial high school inspector would rate all of the schools also, but this was found to be impossible, as the large number of schools included in the study came under the jurisdiction of several high school inspectors, and these inspectors, being relatively new to the area, had not a sufficient first-hand knowledge of all the schools in the area to give each of them a rating.

Any ratings which were obtained, however, reinforced the earlier ratings made by the superintendents. The correlation between the teachers' ratings of their perception of the degree of bureaucratization of their schools and the superintendent's ratings was .36 which is significant at the .01 level. This further reinforced the superintendents' ratings.

Since design of the study required that judges select and rate schools as being either "high bureaucratic" or "low bureaucratic", it was necessary to assume that the judges would judge accurately the "high bureaucratic" and "low bureaucratic" schools. It was also necessary to assume that there was no overlapping so that, for example, the highest "low bureaucratic" school was, not as bureaucratic as the lowest "high bureaucratic" school. If the judges rated a "low bureaucratic" school in one school division or county as being more bureaucratic than a "high bureaucratic" school in another school division or county, or if a "high bureaucratic" school was given a lower rating than a "low bureaucratic" school in another school division or county, then the schools receiving such ratings were not used in this study. In addition, as only the most bureaucratic and the least bureaucratic school of its type in each school division or county was used, schools in the

middle range of bureaucracy were eliminated and the chances of any such overlapping was greatly reduced.

Among the eleven pairs of ratings for selected schools, one set showed only a very slight difference between the superintendent's rating of the high bureaucratic school and the low bureaucratic school. Also, although the high bureaucratic school in the system rated slightly higher than the ratings of any of the low bureaucratic schools, it scored somewhat lower than any of the other high bureaucratic schools. It appeared, therefore, that while this school was the most bureaucratic school within the system, it was not highly bureaucratic in comparison with the other "high bureaucratic" schools used in the study, and therefore this pair of schools was not included in the final sample. This pair of schools is identified as K in Table IV. (See Table IV).

Superintendents were also asked to rate the confidence they had in their judgment of each school which they rated as to high or low bureaucratic. In no case did the superintendent express a low confidence in his rating of the school for any of the twenty schools used in the study.

Table IV presents the bureaucratic characteristics scores for the ten "high bureaucratic" schools and ten "low bureaucratic" schools which were included in the final sample. The superintendents' rating of the ten high

bureaucratic schools ranged from 41 to 52 with a mean of 47.5. The ratings of the low bureaucratic schools ranged from 20 to 35 with a mean of 27.7.

TABLE IV
SUPERINTENDENTS' RATINGS OF HIGH BUREAUCRATIC
AND LOW BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS

School System	High Bureaucratic School	Low Bureaucratic School
A	46	26
B	41	30
C	43	29
D	51	26
E	51	35
F	52	20
G	52	27
H	48	28
I	45	27
J	46	29
K*	37	33

*K was eliminated from the final sample.

The number of full-time teachers (exclusive of principals) reported in the high bureaucratic schools ranged from 7 to 31 with a mean of 18.4. In the low bureaucratic schools, the range was from 10 to 24 with a mean of 18.5. The mean size of all the schools in the study was 18.45 teachers exclusive of principals. (See Appendix F).

Each of the four instruments: the instrument to measure local-cosmopolitan role orientation; the instrument to measure degree of bureaucratization as perceived by teachers; the instrument to measure satisfaction with the school organization; and the questions to determine certain selected teacher characteristics, was included in a composite fifty-one item instrument (Appendix D) and sent to the principals of the twenty schools for distribution to the teachers. Of the 369 teachers who received these instruments, 169 or 91.85 per cent of the teachers in the high bureaucratic schools and 170 or 91.89 per cent of teachers in the low bureaucratic schools, for a total of 339 or 91.87 per cent returned completed instruments. Several other teachers returned partly completed instruments, but with too many questions incomplete to be of use in the study.

The principal of each school distributed the questionnaires to the teachers in the school and collected them when they were completed. He also prepared a code number for each teacher which was placed on each teacher's questionnaire, and which he used in responding to the Principal's Questionnaire. (See Appendix E). In this way, anonymity was assured; while the investigator could match each teacher's questionnaire with the principal's reactions to teachers, he did not actually know the identity of the

individuals, nor did the principal actually see any of the sealed questionnaires.

II. DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN LOCALS AND COSMOPOLITANS

The Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation (Appendix D, Part I) was one of the sections of the composite instrument sent to the teachers. Of the 339 returned, the mean score on this sixteen-item instrument was 8.40 and the standard deviation was 2.49. The respondents were classified according to their responses as locals--those scoring from 1 to 7 on this instrument; cosmopolitans--those scoring 10 or higher on the instrument; and an intermediate group called LCs who scored 8 or 9 on the instrument. The groups were divided roughly in thirds as can be seen from Table V.

III. DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON TEACHERS

Characteristics of teachers in the sample of high bureaucratic schools and low bureaucratic schools were compared by use of chi-square tests of representativeness to determine whether such differences might have implications for appropriate analyses in the testing of the hypotheses (3, pp. 256-257). Tables VI to IX show the results of this comparison. A comparison of numbers of teachers in

TABLE V

DISTRIBUTION AND CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS
 BY TOTAL SCORE ON THE INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE
 LOCAL-COSMOPOLITAN ROLE ORIENTATION

Total Score	Number of Respondents	Classification
1	1	123 Locals
2	2	
3	2	
4	14	
5	22	
6	35	
7	47	
8	60	104 LCs
9	44	
10	43	112 Cosmopolitans
11	32	
12	18	
13	11	
14	6	
15	2	
16	0	
Total	339	339

high and low bureaucratic schools on sex, marital status, and age is shown in Table VI. Table VII shows a comparison on academic and professional training, teaching experience, and experience teaching in the same school. Shown in Table VIII is a comparison of the number of systems in which the teachers have been employed, and whether they attended school in the district in which they are now teaching. Table IX shows a comparison of the number of teachers in high and low bureaucratic schools on satisfaction with teaching and hours per week worked.

As can be seen from Tables VI to IX, no significant differences existed between the characteristics of teachers examined in high bureaucratic schools and low bureaucratic schools. Consequently, differences between high and low bureaucratic schools, if any, cannot be attributed to differences between teachers on any of these eleven teacher characteristics in the two groups of schools.

Table X shows that for the sample of 339 teachers the mean satisfaction score was 42.95 with a standard deviation of 7.62 while the mean bureaucracy description score was 37.69 with a standard deviation of 6.17. The table also shows means and standard deviations on these variables for teachers in both high and low bureaucratic schools.

TABLE VI
COMPARISON OF NUMBERS OF TEACHERS IN HIGH AND
LOW BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS ON SEX, MARITAL
STATUS, AND AGE

Characteristics	High Bureaucratic Schools	Low Bureaucratic Schools	P
<u>Sex:</u>			
Male	71	69	NS
Female	98	101	
<u>Marital Status:</u>			
Single	28	27	NS
Married	134	134	
Widowed, divorced or separated	7	9	
<u>Age:</u>			
Under 30 years	47	51	NS
31 to 40	34	48	
41 to 55	69	54	
Over 55 years	19	17	

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF NUMBERS OF TEACHERS IN HIGH AND
LOW BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS ON ACADEMIC AND
PROFESSIONAL TRAINING, TEACHING EXPERIENCE,
AND EXPERIENCE TEACHING IN SAME SCHOOL

Characteristics	High Bureaucratic Schools	Low Bureaucratic Schools	P
<u>Years of academic and professional training:*</u>			
Less than 2	49	53	NS
2	45	43	
3	22	21	
4 or more	53	53	
<u>Years of teaching experience:</u>			
Up to 5	38	39	NS
6 to 11	33	49	
12 to 20	57	49	
Over 20	41	33	
<u>Years of experience in same school:</u>			
1 or less	34	51	NS
2 to 5	41	39	
6 to 11	48	50	
12 or more	46	30	

* Fractions of years have been disregarded.

TABLE VIII

COMPARISON OF NUMBERS OF TEACHERS IN HIGH AND LOW
BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS ON NUMBER OF SYSTEMS IN WHICH
EMPLOYED, GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT, AND WHETHER THEY
ATTENDED SCHOOL IN DISTRICT IN WHICH NOW
TEACHING

Characteristics	High Bureaucratic Schools	Low Bureaucratic Schools	P
<u>Number of systems in which employed:</u>			
1	57	56	NS
2	48	34	
3	33	43	
4 or more	31	37	
<u>Grade level taught:</u>			
1 to 3	42	39	NS
4 to 6	39	36	
7 to 9	46	53	
10 to 12	42	42	
<u>Attended School in district in which now teaching:</u>			
Yes	62	51	NS
No	107	119	

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF NUMBERS OF TEACHERS IN HIGH AND LOW
BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS ON SATISFACTION WITH
TEACHING AND HOURS PER WEEK WORKED

Characteristics	High Bureaucratic Schools	Low Bureaucratic Schools	P
<u>Satisfaction with teaching:</u>			
Like it very much	105	114	NS
Do not like it much	64	56	
<u>Hours per week worked:</u>			
Under 40	22	28	NS
40 to 44	47	31	
45 to 49	36	44	
Over 50	64	67	

TABLE X

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTION
OF BUREAUCRACY AND SATISFACTION WITH BUREAUCRACY
IN HIGH BUREAUCRATIC AND LOW BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS

Characteristics		High Bureaucratic Schools (N=169)	Low Bureaucratic Schools (N=170)	All Schools (N=339)
Perception of Bureaucracy	Mean	39.91	35.49	37.69
	S.D.	5.59	5.92	6.17
Satisfaction with Bureaucracy	Mean	44.33	41.57	42.95
	S.D.	7.61	7.37	7.62

IV. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

The major analysis in the present study utilizes a technique developed by Bottenberg and Ward, namely Multiple Linear Regression Analysis (1). This technique involves vector operations and is well suited to computer capabilities. Use of the analysis does not assume that predictor variables necessarily come from multivariate normal distributions (1, p. vi). Applied multiple linear regression "seeks only to clarify whether or not a critical variable, when added to a linear expression, significantly reduces the criterion error sum of squares" (5, p. 44).

In applied multiple linear regression, the general approach is to express a vector of the criterion variable data (Y) as a linear combination of a set of predictor vectors:

$$Y = k + a_1 X(1) + a_2 X(2) + a_3 X(3) + E_1$$

where:

Y is a vector of criterion variable data (N x 1)

X(1), X(2), and X(3) are vectors of predictor variable data (N x 1)

a_1 , a_2 , and a_3 are unknown weights associated with the predictor vectors

E_1 is an error of residual vectors (N x 1)

N is the number of observations

k is a constant

The problem is to find a set of weights which will minimize the sum of squares of the elements of the vector E. These are called "least squares weights". The problem is to minimize:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (e_i)^2 = (e_1)^2 + (e_2)^2 + (e_3)^2 + \dots + (e_N)^2$$

Multiple linear regression analysis can be applied in hypothesis testing mainly through the process of comparing the relative effectiveness of two statistical models in expressing the functional relationship between a criterion variable and one or more predictor variables. For example, if it is known that teachers may be classed as locals, LCs, or cosmopolitans, one may ask whether this information can be used to predict satisfaction with teaching. In other words, are there significant differences between any two groups in mean satisfaction with teaching?

Two models can be constructed:

$$\text{MODEL 1. } Y = a_1 X(1) + a_2 X(2) + a_3 X(3) + e$$

in which X(1), X(2), and X(3) are categorical vectors, ones and zeros, representing membership in local, LC, or cosmopolitan groups.

$$\text{MODEL 2. } Y = a_4 X(4) + e$$

in which $X(4)$ is a vector of ones, that is, a vector which places all individuals in one group. This model contains no information about group membership.

In effect, the predicted score for each individual derived from Model 1 (the general or unrestricted model), will be the mean score for his membership group; in Model 2 (the restricted model), the predicted score will be the mean for the total group.

The relative effectiveness of the two models is determined by comparing the error sums of squares. If there is a significant increase in error sums of squares from Model 1 to Model 2, it can be concluded that knowledge of group membership is significant, i.e. that there are significant differences between means. If there is no appreciable increase in error sums of squares, then group means do not differ significantly.

In actual practice, the squared multiple correlation, R^2 , between predicted and observed criterion scores for each model is determined, and the two compared through application of an F ratio:

$$F = \frac{(R_1^2 - R_2^2)/df_1}{1 - R_1^2 / df_2}$$

where:

R_1^2 = squared multiple correlation for Model 1

R_2^2 = squared multiple correlation for Model 2

df₁ = degrees of freedom in numerator

df₂ = degrees of freedom in denominator

(2, p. 15).

Through appropriate models, the analysis can be extended to include controls on variables such as in analysis of covariance, and also to two-way analysis of variance (or other various designs including controlling variables in two-way analysis designs).

The procedures can best be illustrated by describing the analysis for the last three hypotheses first. The general or unrestricted model for the main portion of Hypothesis 7 was as follows:

General (Unrestricted) Model

$$Y = k + a_1 X(1) + a_2 X(2) + a_3 X(3) + a_4 X(4) + a_5 X(5) + a_6 X(6) + E_1$$

where:

Y is a criterion vector (N x 1) representing local-cosmopolitan orientation of teachers

X(1) is a vector representing age of the teacher (N x 1)

X(2) is a vector representing years of teacher training of the teacher (N x 1)

X(3) is a vector representing years of teaching experience of the teacher (N x 1)

$X(4)$ is a vector representing years of teaching experience of the teacher in this school ($N \times 1$)

$X(5)$ is a vector representing the number of systems in which the teacher has taught ($N \times 1$)

$X(6)$ is a vector representing the average number of hours worked per week by the teacher ($N \times 1$)

E_1 is an error vector of the general model

a_1 to a_6 are least squares weights associated with predictor vectors

N is the number of teachers

k is a constant

Restricted Models

The restricted model for testing the relation of age to local-cosmopolitan orientation was:

$$Y = k + a_2 X(2) + a_3 X(3) + a_4 X(4) + a_5 X(5) + a_6 X(6) + E_1$$

That is, the restricted model omits information about age. When this is compared to model 1 in terms of squared multiple correlation and F ratio, the significance of age as a predictor can be determined. The relationships of other characteristics were determined by excluding each in turn from the restricted model.

For hypothesis 8, the same procedure was used, except that in the general (unrestricted) model, the

criterion vector was replaced by a new vector representing teachers' perception of the type of organization of their school. For hypothesis 9, the criterion vector becomes a vector representing satisfaction of teachers with the organization of their school.

Hypotheses 7, 8, and 9 were also concerned with other characteristics of teachers, namely: sex of teacher; marital status; grade level taught; whether or not the teacher himself attended school in the school district in which he now teaches; and the teacher rating of his degree of satisfaction with the organization of the school in which he teaches. Models similar to those described above were used to study the relationship of each predictor to the criterion variable.

The more complex design for testing the first five hypotheses, namely a two-way analysis with controls for other variables, may be diagrammed as follows:

TABLE XI
TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE DESIGN

	<u>Role Orientation</u>			Total
	Local	LC	Cosmopolitan	
High Bureaucratic	X ₆	X ₇	X ₈	X ₁
Low Bureaucratic	X ₉	X ₁₀	X ₁₁	X ₂
Total	X ₃	X ₄	X ₅	

There are six mutually exclusive categories depending upon whether an individual is classed as a local, an LC, or a cosmopolitan in either a high or low bureaucratic school.

X_1 includes all the locals (X_6), LCs (X_7), and cosmopolitans (X_8) in high bureaucratic schools

X_2 includes all the locals (X_9), LCs (X_{10}), and cosmopolitans (X_{11}) in low bureaucratic schools, and so forth

Y is a criterion vector

Row differences on any criterion measure can be determined by comparing the following models:

MODEL 1 (Unrestricted) $Y = a_1 X_1 + a_3 X_3 + a_4 X_4 + a_5 X_5 + \text{Error}$

MODEL 2 (Restricted) $Y = a_3 X_3 + a_4 X_4 + a_5 X_5 + \text{Error}$

Column differences can be determined by comparing these models:

MODEL 1 (Unrestricted) $Y = a_1 X_1 + a_3 X_3 + a_4 X_4 + a_5 X_5 + \text{Error}$

MODEL 3 (Restricted) $Y = a_1 X_1 + \text{Error}$

Interaction* effects can be determined by comparing these models:

MODEL 4 (Unrestricted) $Y = a_6 X_6 + a_7 X_7 + a_8 X_8 + a_9 X_9 + a_{10} X_{10} + a_{11} X_{11} + \text{Error}$

$$\text{MODEL 1 (Restricted)} \quad Y = a_1 X_1 + a_3 X_3 + a_4 X_4 + a_5 X_5 + \text{Error}$$

* Note it is meaningless to test for row and column differences if interaction is significant.

In testing Hypotheses 1 and 2, the criterion was teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy; tests were carried out for row, column, and interaction effects both with and without controlling for satisfaction with school organization.

The criterion in models for testing Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 was teachers' satisfaction with the organization. As above, tests were carried out for row, column, and interaction effects both with and without controls for perception of level of bureaucracy.

Chi Square

Chi square is particularly useful in situations when a comparison is desired between the "observed" and "theoretical" or "expected" frequency distributions. The expected cell frequencies are those we should expect to obtain if the variables were independent of each other, given the marginal totals of the rows and columns.

This test is nonparametric and as such is not restricted to data of the interval or ratio type. This test may therefore be used when either little is known about the population distributions, or when the

distributions are known to depart appreciably from the normal form (4, pp. 158 ff.). For hypothesis 6, the principals' reaction to teachers, the probabilities were calculated by chi-square tests of independence.

For each statistical test, the value of the probability, p , has been reported. If p is greater than .05 ($p > .05$) then the difference is considered not significant. If p is less than .01 ($p < .01$) the difference is very significant. If the value of p is between .01 and .05 ($.01 < p < .05$) a cautious interpretation is made that there is some difference between the groups.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER IV

- (1) Bottenberg, R. A. and J. Ward. Applied Multiple Linear Regression. Technical Documentary Report, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, 1963.
- (2) Division of Educational Research Services. "How to Build Your Own Models for Statistical Analysis." University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1965. (Mimeographed).
- (3) Eddy, W. P. "Teacher Characteristics and Grade IX Social Studies Achievement," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 9:254-263, December, 1963.
- (4) Ferguson, G. A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Incorporated, 1959.
- (5) Quinn, J. W. "An Investigation of Personality and Cognitive Correlates of Religious Devoutness." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1965.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA: PERCEPTION OF AND SATISFACTION WITH ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The central problem of this study was an investigation of the relationships between local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers in a sample of high and low bureaucratic schools and the teachers' descriptions of and satisfaction with the organization of these schools. In addition, the principals were asked to describe their reactions to the teachers as a test of the relationship between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and administrative reactions to organizational members. Finally, certain selected teacher characteristics were related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation, to perception of degree of bureaucratization by the teachers, and to teachers' satisfaction with the school organization in which they worked.

Chapter V is devoted to reporting the analysis of and discussion concerning hypotheses which deal with teachers' perception of and satisfaction with the organization of their schools, as well as the principals' reactions to the teachers.

I. TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

Table XII shows the mean level of bureaucratic characteristics as perceived by teachers in high and low bureaucratic schools with teachers classified as locals, an intermediate group called LCs described earlier, and cosmopolitans. The means differ for high (39.91) and low (35.49) bureaucratic schools and also between role orientation types locals (38.80), LCs (37.56), and cosmopolitans (36.61). The significance of these differences was tested by the analyses for the hypotheses which are set out below.

TABLE XII

MEAN LEVEL OF BUREAUCRATIC CHARACTERISTICS AS
PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS IN HIGH BUREAUCRATIC
AND LOW BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS

School Type	Role Orientation			Total (N=339)
	Local (N=123)	LC (N=104)	Cosmopolitan (N=112)	
High Bureau- cratic Schools	40.87	39.58	38.94	39.91
Low Bureau- cratic Schools	36.32	35.43	34.79	35.49
High Bureau- cratic and Low Bureaucratic Schools	38.80	37.56	36.61	

Results which are reported include the squared multiple correlation for general (unrestricted) and restricted models, the F ratio, the appropriate degrees of freedom and the probability of an F as large as or greater than that observed occurring by chance. The results of comparing pairs of unrestricted and restricted models are reported in one row set in tables such as Table XIII. In each instance information on predictor variables has been included in the unrestricted model and excluded in the restricted model. Controls for a variable are indicated by the expression "in the presence of . . ." which indicates that information about that particular variable was included in both unrestricted and restricted models.

Results

Hypothesis 1. Teacher descriptions of the level of bureaucratization is related to the organizational characteristics of the school; teachers perceive higher levels of bureaucracy in schools classed as high bureaucratic and lower levels of bureaucracy in schools classed as low bureaucratic.

The null hypotheses associated with Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested in a two-way analysis of variance design on data summarized in Table XII, using multiple linear regression models. The test of Hypothesis 1 involved a test for row differences. The regression analysis reported in Table XIII, row set 1, shows an F value of 47.09 which

TABLE XIII
REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF THE LEVEL OF BUREAUCRACY

Row Set	Predictor	Criterion	RSQ* Unrestricted	RSQ* Restricted	df	F	P
1	Organizational classification of schools	Teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy	.1426	.0220	1/335	47.09	<.001
2	Organizational classification of schools in presence of teachers' satisfaction with organization	Teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy	.1944	.1016	1/334	38.57	<.001
3	Local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers in presence of teachers' satisfaction with organization	Teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy	.1944	.1881	2/334	1.29	NS
4	Organizational classification of schools and local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers in presence of teachers' satisfaction with organization	Teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy	.1946	.1944	2/332	.05	NS

* RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

was significant beyond the .001 level. This indicates that there was a significant reduction in ability to predict perceptions of level of bureaucracy when information on organizational classification was ignored, or that there were highly significant differences in teachers' perceptions of level of bureaucratization between high and low bureaucratic schools regardless of their local-cosmopolitan role orientation; that is, the research hypothesis was supported.

Both the measures of teacher satisfaction with the school organization, and their descriptions of the level of bureaucratization in schools, involve teachers' perceptions. It is therefore quite possible that teachers' degree of satisfaction with the school organization might influence their perception of the level of bureaucracy in the schools. It is conceivable that teachers might perceive either higher or lower levels of bureaucracy because they are either satisfied or dissatisfied with the present school organization. In order to check this possibility, the level of teacher satisfaction with the school organization was therefore statistically controlled through appropriate regression models and several analyses were carried out in regard to teachers' perceptions of their school organizational classification.

The regression analysis reported in Table XIII, row set 2, shows an F value of 38.57, which is significant beyond the .001 level. This indicates that when teachers' satisfaction with the organization was statistically controlled, there were still very significant differences in teachers' perceptions of bureaucratization between organizational categories. Statistically, the results support the hypothesis that teachers' perception of the level of bureaucratization is related to the organizational classification of the school. Teachers perceived significantly higher degrees of bureaucracy in the schools classified as high bureaucratic than they perceived in the schools classified as low bureaucratic, even when satisfaction with the school organization was held constant.

Hypothesis 2. Teacher descriptions of the level of bureaucracy is related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation; those who tend to have a local orientation perceive less bureaucratization than those who tend to have a cosmopolitan orientation.

The trend of means in Table XII suggests that locals perceived higher levels of bureaucracy than either LCs or cosmopolitans. The mean scores in high and low bureaucratic schools decreased from 38.8 through 37.56 to 36.61. It is evident that the trend was opposite to the direction hypothesized. The significance of this difference was tested by examining column effects in the two-way analysis of variance design.

The F value of 1.29 reported in Table XIII, row set 3, is not significant. Teachers' perception of the level of bureaucratization was thus shown not to be significantly related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation. Those teachers who were classed as locals did not perceive significantly higher or lower levels of bureaucracy than did those teachers who were classed as cosmopolitans.

Although the means do not suggest an interaction effect, a two-way analysis of variance was used to check for interaction between organizational classification and local-cosmopolitan orientation of teachers on teachers' perception of the level of bureaucracy. The F value of .05 reported in Table XIII, row set 4, is not significant, indicating that teachers' perception of the level of bureaucracy was not affected by any interaction between organizational classification and local-cosmopolitan role orientation.

Discussion

That teachers' perception of the level of bureaucracy is related to the organizational classification of the school based on an external rating was verified by the analysis of the data. While teachers' perceptions of the level of bureaucracy to be found in their schools varied

considerably from teacher to teacher, teachers in general perceived significantly higher levels of bureaucracy in the schools classified as high bureaucratic by the superintendents; they perceived significantly lower levels of bureaucracy in the schools which superintendents classified as low bureaucratic. This relationship was upheld when satisfaction with the organization was controlled. While, in the words of Hall, the ". . . perceptions of participants of their organizations may well be at variance with the officially prescribed structure . . . " (2, p. 35), it would appear from the results shown here that generally the participants in this study, that is the teachers, were able to perceive with reasonable accuracy the level of bureaucracy of their school organization. This also helps lend support to the frequently used method of determining which schools are more and which are less bureaucratic by relying upon teacher perceptions, a technique used by MacKay (4) and Robinson (6).

The hypothesis that teacher descriptions of the level of bureaucratization are related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation was not supported by the results of this study. Any differences in perception of level or degree of bureaucratization by locals and cosmopolitans were not large enough to be significant. Locals did not perceive less bureaucracy than did cosmopolitans, when satisfaction

with the organization was held constant. Any prior socialization, such as suggested by Presthus (5, p. 8), apparently did not have a great enough effect to make locals perceive significantly less bureaucracy, or else it affected cosmopolitans to some extent as well as affecting locals.

II. TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

A number of hypotheses were related to teachers' level of satisfaction with the organization of their schools. Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 were tested using linear regression models on a two-way analysis of variance design.

Results

Hypothesis 3. Teachers, in general, are significantly more satisfied with low bureaucratic schools than with high bureaucratic schools.

The mean satisfaction scores of teachers classified by role orientation and school type are shown in Table XIV. The mean score for teacher satisfaction in high bureaucratic schools was 44.33 and in low bureaucratic schools the mean score was 41.57. These scores indicate that teachers appeared to be more satisfied with high bureaucratic schools, and together with Table XV, row set 1, which reports results of the test for row effects helps to answer the question of whether teachers' level of satisfaction with their school

TABLE XIV

MEAN SATISFACTION OF TEACHERS IN HIGH BUREAUCRATIC
AND LOW BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS

School Type	Role Orientation		
	Local (N=123)	LC (N=104)	Cosmopolitan (N=112) Local, LC, and Cosmopolitan (N=339)
High Bureaucratic Schools	45.80	45.46	41.17 44.33
Low Bureaucratic Schools	42.67	42.37	39.91 41.57
High Bureaucratic and Low Bureaucratic Schools	44.38	43.94	40.44

TABLE XV

REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS OF TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL ORGANIZATION (I)

Row Set	Predictor	Criterion	RSQ* Unrestricted	RSQ* Restricted	df	F	P
1	Organizational classification of schools	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.0798	.0537	1/335	9.49	<.01
2	Organizational classification of schools in presence of teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.1354	.1307	1/334	1.81	NS
3	Local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers in presence of teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.1354	.0989	2/334	7.08	<.001
4	Organizational classification of schools and local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers in presence of teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.1385	.1354	2/332	.60	NS

* RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

organization is related to the level of bureaucracy. Table XV, row set 1, shows an F value of 9.49 which is significant at the .01 level, indicating that teachers were significantly more satisfied with the school organization in high bureaucratic schools, than they were with the school organization in low bureaucratic schools.

As has been stated earlier, both measures of teacher satisfaction with the school organization, and measures of the level of bureaucracy to be found in schools, deal with teachers' perceptions. It is therefore possible that teachers' satisfaction with the school organization is more dependent upon their perception of the level of bureaucracy than upon the actual level or level determined by other means. Teachers' perception of the level of bureaucracy was therefore statistically controlled, and several analyses were carried out in which teachers' satisfaction with the organizational characteristics of their schools was used as the criterion.

Table XV, row set 2, shows that when teachers' perception of the level of bureaucracy was statistically controlled, the resulting F value of 1.81 was not significant. That is, additional information about bureaucratic characteristics of schools in the form of superintendent's descriptions did not contribute significantly to the prediction of teacher satisfaction when teachers' percep-

tions or descriptions of the organizational structure were already included. The product-moment correlation between satisfaction and teachers' descriptions of organizational structure was observed to be .31. Teachers' satisfaction with the school organization was therefore significantly related to their perception of the level of bureaucracy; the bureaucratic features of schools which were not reflected in teachers' descriptions did not contribute significantly to satisfaction with organizational structure.

Hypothesis 4. Teachers classed as locals are significantly more satisfied with the school organization characteristics than teachers who are classed as cosmopolitans.

This hypothesis was tested by means of a two-way analysis of variance design using multiple linear regression models. The regression analysis reported in Table XV, row set 3, shows an F value of 7.08 which is significant beyond the .001 level. This indicates that there were highly significant differences between local, LC and cosmopolitan groups in satisfaction with the school organization when level of school bureaucratization was controlled. The totals shown in Table XIV indicate the direction of the relationship. It can be seen from this table that locals tended to score higher on satisfaction with the school organization than did other groups, while cosmopolitans tended to score the lowest.

Further analysis was required at this stage to determine which of the differences between local-cosmopolitan categories were significant. This was done through the comparison of appropriate regression models; the results are reported in Table XVI. The very low, non-significant F value in row set 1 indicates that there were no significant differences between teachers classed as locals and teachers classed as LCs in satisfaction with organization.

The F value of 10.59 shown in Table XVI, row set 2, is significant at the .01 level. This indicates that there were highly significant differences between teachers classed as locals and teachers classed as cosmopolitans in satisfaction with the organization. Similarly, the F value of 11.38 which is significant at the .001 level shown in Table XVI, row set 3, indicates that there were very significant differences in satisfaction with the organization of teachers classed as LCs and those classed as cosmopolitans.

Statistically, then, results show that teachers who were classed as locals and those who were classed as LCs differed from cosmopolitans in that they were significantly more satisfied with the school organization. Locals, however, were not significantly more satisfied with the school organization than were teachers classed as LCs.

TABLE XVI

REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS OF TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL ORGANIZATION (II)

Row Set	Predictor	Criterion	RSQ* Unrestricted	RSQ* Restricted	df	F	P
1	Local or LC role orientation of teachers in presence of teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.1307	.1307	1/336	.00	NS
2	Local or cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers in presence of teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.1307	.1033	1/336	10.59	<.01
3	LC or cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers in presence of teachers' perception of level of bureaucracy	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.1307	.1013	1/336	11.38	<.001

* RSQ = squared multiple correlation

Hypothesis 5. Teacher satisfaction with the type of school organization is related to both local-cosmopolitan role orientation and degree of bureaucratization; locals tend to be more satisfied with high bureaucratic schools, while cosmopolitans tend to be more satisfied with low bureaucratic schools.

This hypothesis was tested by means of the interaction effect in the two-way analysis of variance multiple linear regression model. The regression analysis reported in Table XV, page 78, row set 4, shows an F value of 0.6 which is not statistically significant. This indicates that there is no significant interaction effect; teachers who were classed as locals were not significantly more satisfied with high bureaucratic schools or less satisfied with low bureaucratic schools than were teachers who were cosmopolitans. Similarly, teachers who were classed as cosmopolitans were not significantly more satisfied with high bureaucratic or less satisfied with low bureaucratic schools than were teachers who were locals.

Discussion

MacKay had found earlier, that teachers favored higher levels of bureaucratization in their schools than were present (4, p. 72). Hartley also found that teachers who perceived a high level of bureaucracy received a higher score on satisfaction (3, p. 85). A very significant relationship, significant at the .002 level, was found in

the present study between teachers' satisfaction and the presence of bureaucratic characteristics; however, when teachers' perception of level of bureaucratization was held constant, the probability was reduced to .18 which indicates a tendency toward the predicted relationship, but is not significant. Since studies such as those by MacKay and Hartley (4, 3) used teachers' descriptions of organizational characteristics as the measure of the level of bureaucratization, they were unable to hold this factor constant and to test the relationship between structural characteristics and satisfaction with such characteristics after the effects of teachers' perception of the level of bureaucratization had been removed. The use of an external criterion, such as superintendents' ratings in this study, made it possible to relate teachers' satisfaction to level of bureaucratization when teachers' perception of the structural characteristics was held constant.

The suggestion that bureaucracy is "an organization that maximizes efficiency . . ." (1, p. 60), perhaps helps account for the fact that teachers are not satisfied with low bureaucratic schools. The fact that the bureaucratic organizational characteristics stress efficiency and so the system is structured to the extent where teachers can predict response to their future behavior with some degree

of reliability, may help account for teachers regarding it more favorably than might otherwise be expected.

The low bureaucratic schools may rely on unanticipated, spur of the moment decisions or on traditional norms; either of which is subject to misunderstanding, and is therefore less predictable than the well-defined procedures which would be found in schools with more bureaucratic characteristics. The teachers, as members of the school with well-defined procedures may be better able to predict what will happen, and so are more satisfied with this type of organization.

The hypothesis that locals will be significantly more satisfied with the school organization generally, and that cosmopolitans will be significantly less satisfied, is supported statistically by this study. A review of the literature indicated that locals generally tended to exhibit greater loyalty and commitment to organizational affairs. It was on this basis that the hypothesis that locals would be more satisfied with the organization was formulated.

Hartley found that locals were less satisfied than cosmopolitans; however, Hartley's measure of satisfaction concerned itself with such things as the extent of teachers' satisfaction with the community, with parent groups, with individual children, and with interest displayed by students.

It was not a measure of satisfaction with the organization of the school.

The hypothesis that locals will be more satisfied with high bureaucratic schools, and cosmopolitans will be more satisfied with low bureaucratic schools was not supported by this study. There was no significant interaction between local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers and type of school organization in relation to satisfaction with organization.

Locals were more loyal to the school organization, and more satisfied with the organization generally, but this did not appear to be affected by the level of bureaucratic characteristics of the school organization.

III. REACTIONS TO TEACHERS

The hypothesis that follows was based on the assumption that the nature of various organizational and administrative reactions to teachers would depend upon whether the teachers tended to be locals or cosmopolitans.

Results

Hypothesis 6. Principals perceive teachers classed as locals as being significantly (1) more willing to undertake unexpected duties, (2) more likely to warrant promotion, (3) more trustworthy, (4) more likely to be elected to local Alberta Teachers' Association executive positions, and (5) more likely to be invited to social gatherings by principals than teachers classed as cosmopolitans.

Principals of each of the schools were asked for their reactions to and perceptions of the teachers in the school on five pairs of questions. For the first set of five questions, principals were asked for their choices on favorable response questions, while for the second set of five questions they were asked for their choices on unfavorable response questions. These questions are as follows:

- (1) Which teachers in your school would be more willing to undertake some unexpected extra-curricular duties?
- (2) Which teachers in your school would be less willing to undertake some unexpected extra-curricular duties?
- (3) Which teachers in your school would you think you might recommend for promotion to vice-principal of a school?
- (4) Which teachers in your school would you think you might be least likely to recommend for a promotion?
- (5) Which teachers in your school could best be trusted to work on their own?
- (6) Which teachers in your school could least be trusted to work on their own?

- (7) If you were planning a social gathering, which teachers in your school would you be most likely to invite to attend?
- (8) If you were planning a social gathering, which teachers in your school would you be least likely to invite to attend?
- (9) Which teachers in your school would you consider to be most likely to be elected to the position of president of your A.T.A. local?
- (10) Which teachers in your school would you consider to be least likely to be elected to an executive position in your A.T.A. local?
(See Appendix E).

Principals were encouraged to name two individual teachers for each of these ten choices. The classification of teachers as locals, LCs, and cosmopolitans was used to determine whether principals reacted more favorably to one group over another. Because of the small number of teachers involved, it was not possible to work out any meaningful statistical difference within individual schools, but chi-square tests of independence were used to test for significant differences on each item between local-cosmopolitan groups in all of the high bureaucratic schools, in all of the low bureaucratic schools, and in the total of all the high and low bureaucratic schools.

General Results. A number of principals did not give answers to all of the questions. One principal, for example, did not name any teacher for the item which asked which teachers in the school would he recommend for promotion.

Three principals refused to name any teachers for item 5; they reported that all teachers, or "all but the one listed in item 6" could work well on their own. Item 6 reflected the answers to item 5 since it asked about teachers who could not be trusted to work on their own.

A number of principals would not choose any teacher for item 7. One, in fact, said that he never invited any of the teachers to a social gathering unless he was able to invite them all at one time. Other principals gave the same type of response to this question. Even so, all but five principals did finally choose some candidates for item 7 and item 8.

All principals chose one or more teachers in response to item 9, and only one could not decide for item 10, teachers who might have least chance of winning an Alberta Teachers' Association local executive position.

Results for All Schools. Table XVII shows the frequency distribution of teachers in the three local-cosmopolitan categories in all schools for the favorable

TABLE XVII

PRINCIPALS' REACTIONS TO TEACHERS IN BOTH HIGH AND LOW BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS
IN RELATION TO THE FAVORABLE RESPONSE ITEMS

Question Area	Teachers' Role Orientation			Chi-Square*
	Locals	LCs	Cosmopolitans	
1. Willing to do extra-curricular duties.	33	21	18	NS
3. Principal is likely to recommend for promotion.	15	12	12	NS
5. Could be trusted to work on their own.	30	25	26	NS
7. Principal is likely to invite to social gathering.	20	14	18	NS
9. Most likely to be elected to A.T.A. office.	18	10	12	NS

$$* \text{ Chi-square} = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

Where: O = the observed frequencies stated, and
E = the expected frequencies derived from the proportion of locals, LCs and cosmopolitans found in the sample of schools.

response questions. The questions identify the number of teachers most willing to undertake some unexpected extra-curricular duties; teachers whom principal would be most likely to recommend for promotions; teachers who could best be trusted to work on their own; teachers whom principal would be most willing to invite to a social gathering; and teachers whom principal would consider most likely to be elected to an Alberta Teachers' Association local executive position.

Chi-square tests of independence fail to show any significant differences between the observed and the expected results on any of these five questions among the teachers in the total of both high and low bureaucratic schools. The expected frequencies were derived from the proportion of locals, LCs and cosmopolitans found in the sample of schools.

Table XVIII shows the principals' reactions to teachers in the total of both high and low bureaucratic schools in relation to the unfavorable response questions: teachers least willing to undertake some unexpected extra-curricular duties; teachers whom principal would be least willing to recommend for promotion; teachers who could least be trusted to work on their own; teachers whom principal would be least likely to invite to a social gathering; and teachers whom principal would consider

TABLE XVIII

PRINCIPALS' REACTIONS TO TEACHERS IN BOTH HIGH AND LOW BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS
IN RELATION TO THE UNFAVORABLE RESPONSE ITEMS

Question Area	Teachers' Role Orientation		Chi-Square*
	Locals	Cosmopolitans	
2. Unwilling to do extra-curricular duties.	13	13	.01 < p < .02
4. Principal not likely to recommend for promotion.	13	13	NS
6. Could not be trusted to work on their own.	12	10	NS
8. Principal not likely to invite to social gathering.	10	11	NS
10. Least likely to be elected to A.T.A. office.	15	14	NS

$$* \text{ Chi-square} = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

Where: O = the observed frequencies stated, and
E = the expected frequencies derived from
the proportion of locals, LCs and
cosmopolitans found in the sample of
schools.

least likely to be elected to an Alberta Teachers' Association local executive position.

The chi-square test of independence shows a significant difference between the observed and the expected frequencies on only one item, namely item 2-- teachers least willing to undertake some unexpected extra-curricular duties. Principals perceived cosmopolitans to be somewhat less willing to undertake some unexpected extra-curricular duties, while they saw locals as being less reluctant to perform some unexpected extra-curricular duties.

Comparison of Responses in High and Low Bureaucratic Schools. Tables XIX and XX compare the principals' reactions to or perceptions of teachers in high bureaucratic schools and low bureaucratic schools to determine whether the way in which the teachers with different orientations are viewed is related to the organizational classification of schools.

Table XIX compares the principals' perceptions of teachers in high and low bureaucratic schools on the favorable response questions. Chi-square tests of independence fail to show any significant differences between the high bureaucratic schools and the low bureaucratic schools on any of these five questions or on the totals of the five favorable response questions.

TABLE XIX

COMPARISON OF PRINCIPALS' REACTIONS TO LOCAL-COSMOPOLITAN ROLE ORIENTATION OF
TEACHERS IN HIGH BUREAUCRATIC AND LOW BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS
ON FAVORABLE RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Question Area	School Type	Locals	LCs	Cosmo- politans	Significance of Chi-Square
1. Willing to do extra-curricular duties.	High Bureaucratic Low Bureaucratic	16 17	9 12	7 11	NS
3. Principal is likely to recommend for promotion.	High Bureaucratic Low Bureaucratic	8 7	7 5	4 8	NS
5. Could be trusted to work on their own.	High Bureaucratic Low Bureaucratic	12 18	13 12	9 7	NS
7. Principal is likely to invite to social gathering.	High Bureaucratic Low Bureaucratic	9 11	3 11	6 12	NS
9. Most likely to be elected to A.T.A. office.	High Bureaucratic Low Bureaucratic	7 11	7 3	6 6	NS

TABLE XX

COMPARISON OF PRINCIPALS' REACTIONS TO LOCAL-COSMOPOLITAN ROLE ORIENTATION OF
TEACHERS IN HIGH BUREAUCRATIC AND LOW BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOLS
ON UNFAVORABLE RESPONSE QUESTIONS

Question Area	School Type	Locals	LCs	Cosmo- politans of Chi-Square	Significance
2. Unwilling to do extra-curricular duties.	High Bureaucratic Low Bureaucratic	7 6	8 5	11 14	NS
4. Principal not likely to recommend for promotion.	High Bureaucratic Low Bureaucratic	8 5	7 6	9 13	NS
6. Could not be trusted to work on their own.	High Bureaucratic Low Bureaucratic	4 8	3 7	3 6	NS
8. Principal not likely to invite to social gathering.	High Bureaucratic Low Bureaucratic	2 8	5 6	12 9	NS
10. Least likely to be elected to A.T.A. office.	High Bureaucratic Low Bureaucratic	7 8	9 5	5 15	NS

Table XX shows the frequency distribution of teachers in the three local-cosmopolitan categories for high and low bureaucratic schools on each of the five unfavorable response questions. Chi-square tests of independence fail to show any significant differences between high and low bureaucratic schools on any of these five questions or on the totals of these five unfavorable response questions.

The foregoing analysis serves to help support the conclusion that teachers with differing local-cosmopolitan role orientations are regarded no differently in high bureaucratic schools than they are in low bureaucratic schools.

Discussion

No consistently significant relationship was found between degree of bureaucratization of schools, local-cosmopolitan orientation, and choice of teachers on the questions asked of principals.

Principals did not choose locals significantly more often than they chose cosmopolitans for any of the favorable responses in the schools used in the study; however, there was a significant difference among role orientations of teachers and the frequency with which they were identified by principals as "unwilling to do extra-curricular duties."

The results, to only a very slight extent, supported the hypothesis set forth.

IV. SUMMARY

An attempt was made in this study, to relate teachers' perception of the level of bureaucratization in the school to the local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers and to the organizational classification of schools. A significant relationship was found to exist between teachers' perceptions of the level of bureaucracy and the classification of schools as high or low bureaucratic, but no significant relationship was found between teacher description of level of bureaucratization and the teacher's local-cosmopolitan role orientation.

Teachers' satisfaction with the level of bureaucracy was related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation, and to the organizational classification of the school. A significant relationship was found between teacher satisfaction with the level of bureaucracy and local-cosmopolitan role orientation. Teachers who were locals and teachers who were LCs were more satisfied with their school organization than were teachers who were cosmopolitans. Teacher satisfaction with the level of bureaucracy was found not to be significantly related to the organizational classification of the school, or to the

interaction effect between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and organizational classification.

The last part of this chapter presented data relating principals' favorable and unfavorable reactions to teachers on selected questions, to local-cosmopolitan role orientation in both high and low bureaucratic schools. No significant differences between principals' reactions to teachers and local-cosmopolitan role orientation were found on any of the favorable questions. Principals reacted less favorably to cosmopolitans than to locals on only one unfavorable response item.

REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER V

- (1) Blau, P. M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1964.
- (2) Hall, Richard H. "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment," American Journal of Sociology, 69, July, 1963.
- (3) Hartley, H. J. "Bureaucracy and Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation Examined with Selected Criterion Variables." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1964.
- (4) MacKay, D. A. "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relation to Other Characteristics of School Organization." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.
- (5) Presthus, R. The Organizational Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- (6) Robinson, N. "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1966.

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF DATA: TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

This chapter is devoted to reporting the results of the hypotheses relating teacher characteristics to local-cosmopolitan role orientation, to perception of level of bureaucratization by the teachers, and to teachers' satisfaction with the school organization in which they worked.

I. TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND ROLE ORIENTATION

The literature reviewed earlier mentioned some of the characteristics which have been found to distinguish between locals and cosmopolitans. This section reports the characteristics which appear to distinguish between locals and cosmopolitans in this study. The main hypothesis tested was Hypothesis 7: Local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers is related to a number of personal and professional characteristics of teachers.

Results

This hypothesis was tested by means of both simple and multiple correlation analysis using multiple linear regression models. Table XXI shows the Pearson product-moment intercorrelation of each of the teacher character-

TABLE XXI

INTERCORRELATION OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND LOCAL-COSMOPOLITAN
ORIENTATION OF TEACHERS (N=339)

Teacher Characteristics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Sex	1.00	.19	.10	-.46	.06	.10	.06	-.65	.00	-.22	-.13	-.20
2. Marital Status		1.00	.34	-.17	.28	.22	.13	-.18	.10	-.12	-.07	-.05
3. Age			1.00	-.01	.80	.50	.39	-.08	.20	-.17	.01	-.10
4. Years of Training				1.00	.07	-.04	.06	.61	.02	.12	.17	.27
5. Years of Experience					1.00	.70	.40	-.02	.08	-.08	-.07	-.03
6. Years of Experience in Same School						1.00	-.03	-.05	-.16	.01	-.09	-.12
7. Number of Systems Taught In							1.00	.01	.30	-.08	.02	.05
8. Grade Level								1.00	.01	.15	.16	.24
9. Attended School in District									1.00	.03	-.02	.11
10. Satisfied with Teaching Career										1.00	-.09	.16
11. Number of Hours per Week											1.00	.04
12. Local-cosmopolitan Orientation												1.00

Pearson r required for significance is .11 at .05 level and .14 at .01 level.

istics in question and local-cosmopolitan orientation of teachers; these are more useful for establishing the direction of a relationship than for determining significance since effects of other variables are not controlled. Table XXII shows the relationship between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and each of the following teacher characteristics; age; number of years of academic and professional training; years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in same school; number of systems in which the teacher has taught; and the average number of hours per week devoted to the teaching job, in the presence of all the others of these characteristics. The characteristics which related to teaching, such as years of training and experience were included in this group. Since age is highly correlated with training and experience, it was also included with these characteristics in the analysis.

The unrestricted model for each of the above analyses included all six predictors; restricted models included all predictors with the exception of the one under analysis. Thus the analysis revealed the unique contribution of each predictor in the presence of the other five predictors. The multiple linear regression results presented in Table XXII indicate that a significant relationship existed between local-cosmopolitan role

TABLE XXII

REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL-COSMOPOLITAN ROLE ORIENTATION AND SELECTED TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS (I)

Row Set	Predictor*	Criterion	RSQ** Unrestricted	RSQ** Restricted	df	F	P
1	Age	Role Orientation	.1008	.0879	1/333	4.76	<.05
2	Years of Training	Role Orientation	.1008	.0437	1/333	21.13	<.001
3	Years of Teaching Experience	Role Orientation	.1008	.0927	1/333	3.00	NS
4	Years of Experience Teaching in Same School	Role Orientation	.1008	.0910	1/333	3.63	NS
5	Number of Systems Taught In	Role Orientation	.1008	.1004	1/333	.15	NS
6	Number of hours Devoted to Teaching Job	Role Orientation	.1008	.1008	1/333	.00	NS

* Each predictor is in the presence of the others.

** RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

orientation and age of teachers. The negative correlation of $-.10$ reported in Table XXI indicates that younger teachers tended to be cosmopolitans and older teachers tended to be locals. Local-cosmopolitan role orientation was also significantly related to years of teacher training. A positive correlation of $.27$ reported in Table XXI shows that teachers with more training tended to be cosmopolitans and teachers with less training tended to be locals. No significant relationships existed between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in same school; number of systems in which the teacher has taught; and the average number of hours devoted to the teaching job by teachers.

Table XXIII shows the relationship between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and the variables sex of teacher and grade level assignments, each in the presence of the other. When sex of teacher and grade level assignment were related individually to local-cosmopolitan role orientation, highly significant relationships were found in each case. Since many female teachers were also elementary school teachers, it was decided to relate each of these characteristics to local-cosmopolitan role orientation in the presence of the other. It can be seen from Table XXIII that sex of teachers was not significantly related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation in the

TABLE XXIII
REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL-
COSMOPOLITAN ROLE ORIENTATION AND SELECTED TEACHER
CHARACTERISTICS (II)

Row Set	Predictor*	Criterion	RSQ** Unres- tricted	RSQ** Res- tricted	df	F	P
1	Sex of teacher	Role Orientation	.0681	.0650	1/337	1.12	NS
2	Grade level taught	Role Orientation	.0681	.0381	1/337	10.85	<.001

* Each predictor is in the presence of the other.

** RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

presence of grade level assignment, however grade level assignment was significantly related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation. A positive correlation of .24 shown in Table XXI indicates that teachers of lower grades tended toward a local orientation while teachers of higher grades tended toward a cosmopolitan orientation.

Table XXIV shows the relationship between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and each of the following teacher characteristics: marital status; whether the teacher attended school in the district in which he was teaching; and the degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career. It can be seen that a significant relation exists between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and whether the teacher attended school in the district in which he was teaching. A positive correlation of .11 can be seen in Table XXI, indicating that those who attended school in the district in which they were teaching, tended to be locals, while those who did not attend school in the district tended to be cosmopolitans. There is a very significant relationship between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and satisfaction with teaching as a career. A positive correlation of .16 shown in Table XXI indicates that locals tended to be more satisfied with teaching as a career than were cosmopolitans. No significant relationship existed between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and marital status.

TABLE XXIV

REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL-COSMOPOLITAN ROLE ORIENTATION AND SELECTED TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS (III)

Row Set	Predictor	Criterion	RSQ* Unrestricted	RSQ* Restricted	df	F	P
1	Marital status	Role Orientation	.0053	.0000	2/336	.90	NS
2	Attended school in district	Role Orientation	.0117	.0000	1/337	3.97	<.05
3	Satisfied with teaching career	Role Orientation	.0346	.0000	1/337	12.09	<.001

* RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

Discussion

On the basis of this study, then, teachers who were classed as cosmopolitans might be described as being significantly different from those teachers who were locals in that they had more years of academic and professional training, and they had a lower degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career. Cosmopolitans were also somewhat younger than locals; they taught at higher grade levels; and were somewhat less likely to have attended school in the district in which they were teaching, than were locals.

Most of these findings regarding characteristics of locals and of cosmopolitans were similar to those reported in previous studies. On the other hand, several hypotheses based on previous research were not supported in the present study. It was particularly interesting to find no significant relationships between sex of teachers and local-cosmopolitan role orientation when grade level taught was held constant. It was hypothesized that years of teaching experience in the same school, and also the number of systems in which teachers had taught would be significantly related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation; teachers who were locals might be expected to have significantly more years of experience teaching in the same school, and would have taught in significantly fewer systems, than would cosmopolitans. These relationships were not substantiated.

II. TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS IN RELATION TO PERCEPTION OF BUREAUCRACY

It was hypothesized that teacher descriptions or perceptions of the level of bureaucracy is related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers. Findings related to this hypothesis were reported in the previous chapter. It was also hypothesized that teachers' perception of the level of bureaucracy is related to other selected characteristics of teachers. Hypothesis 8 is dealt with in the present section.

Teachers' descriptions of the level of bureaucratization is related to personal and professional characteristics, namely: age; number of years of academic and professional training; years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in same school; number of systems in which the teacher has taught; the average number of clock hours per week devoted to the teaching job; sex of teacher; marital status; grade level assignment; whether the teacher attended school in the district in which he is teaching; and the degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career.

Results

Table XXV shows the intercorrelation of each of the teacher characteristics in question and teacher

TABLE XXV

INTERCORRELATION OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND TEACHER DESCRIPTIONS
OR PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEVEL OF BUREAUCRATIZATION (N=339)

Teacher Characteristics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Sex	1.00	.19	.10	-.46	.06	.10	.06	-.65	-.00	-.22	-.13	.18
2. Marital Status		1.00	.34	-.17	.28	.22	.13	-.18	.10	-.12	-.07	.09
3. Age			1.00	-.01	.80	.50	.39	-.08	.20	-.17	.01	.19
4. Years of Training				1.00	.07	-.04	.06	.61	.02	.12	.17	-.12
5. Years of Experience					1.00	.70	.39	-.02	.08	-.08	-.07	.18
6. Years of Experience in Same School						1.00	-.03	-.05	-.16	.01	-.09	.11
7. Number of Systems Taught In							1.00	.01	.30	-.08	.02	.07
8. Grade Level Taught								1.00	.01	.15	.16	-.23
9. Attended School in District									1.00	.03	-.02	.03
10. Satisfied with Teaching Career										1.00	-.09	-.11
11. Number of Hours per Week											1.00	-.01
12. Teacher Descriptions of Bureaucratization												1.00

Pearson r required for significance is .11 at .05 level and .14 at .01 level.

descriptions of the level of bureaucratization of schools. Table XXVI shows multiple linear regression results of analysis of the relationship between teacher descriptions or perceptions of the level of bureaucratization and each of the following teacher characteristics: age; number of years of academic and professional training; years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in same school; number of systems in which the teacher has taught; and the average number of hours per week devoted to the teaching job, in the presence of all the other of these characteristics. An F ratio of 6.36 which is significant at the .05 level indicates a relationship between teachers' perception of bureaucracy and the number of years of academic and professional training of teachers. A negative correlation of $-.12$ presented in Table XXV shows that teachers with fewer years of training perceived somewhat more bureaucracy, while teachers with more years of training perceived somewhat less bureaucracy. No significant relationships existed between teachers' perceptions of bureaucracy and the other characteristics, namely: age; number of years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in same school; number of systems in which the teacher has taught; and the average number of hours per week devoted to the teaching job.

TABLE XXVI

REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF BUREAUCRACY AND SELECTED TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS (I)

Row Set	Predictor*	Criterion	RSQ** Unrestricted	RSQ** Restricted	df	F	P
1	Age	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0560	.0537	1/333	.82	NS
2	Years of training	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0560	.0380	1/333	6.36	<.05
3	Years of teaching experience	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0560	.0498	1/333	2.17	NS
4	Years of experience teaching in same school	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0560	.0548	1/333	.41	NS
5	Number of systems taught in	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0560	.0554	1/333	.20	NS
6	Number of hours devoted to teaching job	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0560	.0554	1/333	.22	NS

* Each predictor in the presence of the others.

** RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

Table XXVII shows the relationship between teachers' perceptions of bureaucracy and (1) sex of teachers and (2) grade level assignment, each in the presence of the other. It can be seen that sex of teachers was not significantly related to teachers' perceptions of bureaucracy in the presence of grade level. Grade level assignment was significantly related to teachers' perceptions of bureaucracy, however. The correlation of $-.23$ reported in Table XXV indicates that teachers teaching lower grades perceived a significantly greater degree of bureaucracy than did teachers in higher grades.

Table XXVIII shows the relationship between teachers' perceptions of bureaucracy and each of the following teacher characteristics: marital status; whether the teacher attended school in the district in which he was teaching; and the degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career. It can be seen that a relationship significant at the $.05$ level existed between teacher perception of level of bureaucratization in the school and degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career. The negative correlation of $-.11$ shown in Table XXV indicates that those teachers who liked teaching as a career perceived somewhat higher levels of bureaucracy, and those who disliked teaching as a career perceived somewhat lower levels of bureaucracy. There were no significant relationships found between teachers'

TABLE XXVII

REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF BUREAUCRACY AND
SELECTED TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS (II)

Row Set	Predictor*	Criterion	RSQ** Unres- tricted	RSQ** Res- tricted	df	F	P
1	Sex of teacher	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0624	.0614	1/337	.36	NS
2	Grade level taught	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0624	.0310	1/337	11.29	<.001

* Each prediction is in the presence of the other.

** RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

TABLE XXVIII

REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN TEACHERS' PERCEPTION OF BUREAUCRACY AND
SELECTED TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS (III)

Row Set	Predictor	Criterion	RSQ* Unres- tricted	RSQ* Res- tricted	df	F	P
1	Marital status	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0081	.0000	2/333	1.38	NS
2	Attended school in district	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0011	.0000	1/337	.36	NS
3	Satisfied with teach- ing career	Teachers' perception of bureaucracy	.0142	.0000	1/337	4.86	<.05

* RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

perceptions of bureaucracy and either marital status or whether the teacher attended school in the district in which he was teaching.

Discussion

In summary, then, the following characteristics were found to be significantly related to teachers' perception of the level of bureaucratization of schools: number of years of academic and professional training; grade level assignment; and satisfaction with teaching as a career. Those teachers who perceived higher levels of bureaucracy were somewhat more likely to have the following characteristics: they had less training; they were more likely to be teaching at lower grade levels; and were likely to be more satisfied with teaching as a career, than those teachers who perceived lower levels of bureaucracy.

One might expect that those promoted to administrative positions would be likely to have more training than the average teacher. One would also expect to find in schools having all grades from one to eleven or one to twelve, that the principals are chosen from among the senior high school teachers. Therefore, teachers with less training, and elementary school teachers in this type of school, might feel themselves to be further removed from

the administrative hierarchy than might high school teachers, and teachers with more training. This feeling might influence them to perceive a greater degree of bureaucracy in their schools.

III. TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS IN RELATION TO SATISFACTION WITH SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

The hypothesis that certain selected teacher characteristics would be related to teacher satisfaction with the school organization is dealt with in the present section.

Specifically, Hypothesis 9 stated that: teacher satisfaction with the school organization is related to personal and professional characteristics, namely: age; number of years of academic and professional training; years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in same school; number of systems in which the teacher has taught; the average number of clock hours per week devoted to the teaching job; sex of teacher; marital status; grade level assignment; whether the teacher attended school in the district in which he is teaching; and the degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career.

Results

Table XXIX shows the intercorrelation of each of the teacher characteristics in question and teacher

TABLE XXIX

INTERCORRELATION OF TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS AND TEACHER SATISFACTION
WITH THE SCHOOL ORGANIZATION (N=339)

Teacher Characteristics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Sex	1.00	.19	.10	-.46	.06	.10	.06	-.65	.00	-.22	-.13	.09
2. Marital Status		1.00	.34	-.17	.28	.22	.13	-.18	.10	-.12	-.07	-.02
3. Age			1.00	-.01	.80	.50	.39	-.08	.20	-.17	.01	.13
4. Years of Training				1.00	.07	-.04	.06	.61	.02	.12	.17	-.07
5. Years of Experience					1.00	.70	.39	-.02	.08	-.08	-.07	.09
6. Years of Experience in Same School						1.00	-.03	-.05	-.16	.01	-.09	-.03
7. Number of Systems Taught In							1.00	.01	.30	-.08	.02	.03
8. Grade Level Taught								1.00	.01	.15	.16	-.12
9. Attended School in District									1.00	.03	-.02	.06
10. Satisfied With Teaching Career										1.00	-.09	-.11
11. Number of Hours per Week											1.00	-.07
12. Satisfaction with Organization												1.00

Pearson r required for significance is .11 at .05 level and .14 at .01 level.

satisfaction with the school organization. Table XXX shows the relationship between teacher satisfaction with the school organization and each of the following teacher characteristics: age; number of years of academic and professional training; years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in same school; number of systems in which the teacher has taught; and the average number of hours per week devoted to the teaching job, in the presence of all the others of these characteristics. An F ratio of 9.34 indicates a relationship significant at the .01 level between teachers' satisfaction with the organization and the number of years of experience teaching in the same school when effects of other variables was controlled. The negative correlation of $-.03$ reported in Table XXIX indicates the direction of the relationship: teachers with fewer years of experience teaching in the same school were more satisfied with the organization of the school, whereas those teachers with more years of experience in the same school were less satisfied with the organization of the school. No significant relationships were found between teachers' satisfaction with the school organization and the other characteristics, namely: age; number of years of academic and professional training; years of teaching experience generally; the number of

TABLE XXX

REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH THE ORGANIZATION AND SELECTED TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS (I)

Row Set	Predictor*	Criterion	RSQ** Unrestricted	RSQ** Restricted	df	F	P
1	Age	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.0523	.0465	1/333	2.03	NS
2	Years of training	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.0523	.0462	1/333	2.14	NS
3	Years of teaching experience	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.0523	.0429	1/333	3.29	NS
4	Years of experience teaching in same school	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.0523	.0257	1/333	9.34	<.01
5	Number of systems taught in	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.0523	.0439	1/333	2.95	NS
6	Number of hours devoted to teaching job	Teachers' satisfaction with organization	.0523	.0488	1/333	1.21	NS

* Each predictor in the presence of the others.

** RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

systems in which the teacher has taught; and the average number of hours per week devoted to the teaching job.

Table XXXI shows the relationship between teachers' satisfaction with the organization and sex of teacher and grade level assignment. There were no significant relationships between teacher satisfaction with the organization and either of these teacher characteristics.

Table XXXII shows the relationship between teacher satisfaction with the organization and each of the following teacher characteristics: marital status; whether the teacher attended school in the district in which he was teaching; and the degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career. No significant differences between any of these categories were observed in level of satisfaction.

Discussion

Only one of the teacher characteristics was significantly related to teacher satisfaction with their school organization; this was teaching experience in the same school. The more years of experience a teacher had in the same school, the less satisfied was he likely to be with the organization of the school.

Perhaps this rather unexpected relationship might be attributed to teachers who had been in the same school for a number of years having had more time in which to find

TABLE XXXI

REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH THE ORGANIZATION AND SELECTED
TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS (II)

Row Set	Predictor	Criterion	RSQ* Unres- tricted	RSQ* Res- tricted	df	F	P
1	Sex of teacher	Teachers' satis- faction with organization	.0086	.0000	1/337	2.91	NS
2	Grade level taught	Teachers' satis- faction with organization	.0156	.0000	3/335	1.76	NS

* RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

TABLE XXXII
REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS PERTAINING TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH THE ORGANIZATION AND SELECTED
TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS (III)

Row Set	Predictor	Criterion	RSQ* Unres- tricted	RSQ* Res- tricted	df	F	P
1	Marital status	Teachers' satis- faction with organization	.0017	.0000	2/336	.28	NS
2	Attended school in district	Teachers' satis- faction with organization	.0031	.0000	1/337	1.06	NS
3	Satisfied with teaching career	Teachers' satis- faction with organization	.0112	.0000	1/337	3.82	NS

* RSQ = squared multiple correlation.

out the unsatisfactory aspects of the organization of that school. Another possible explanation is that those teachers who had been in the same school for a longer period of time are more likely to have been passed over for promotion to some administrative position such as principal or vice-principal, and were therefore more likely to be dissatisfied with the school organization.

IV. SUMMARY

An attempt was made in this study to relate teachers' local-cosmopolitan role orientation, perceptions of bureaucracy, and satisfaction with the organization to certain selected teacher characteristics.

Locals were found to have significantly fewer years of academic and professional training, and to have a significantly greater degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career than cosmopolitans. Locals also were somewhat older, were somewhat more likely to have attended school in the same district where they were teaching, and were somewhat more likely to be teaching at lower grade levels, while cosmopolitans were somewhat younger, were somewhat less likely to have attended school in the same district where they were teaching, and were more likely to be teaching at higher grade levels than were locals.

Teachers who perceived greater bureaucratization had somewhat less training, were somewhat more satisfied with teaching as a career, and had a lower grade assignment than teachers who perceived less bureaucratization.

Teachers who had more years of experience teaching in the same school were less satisfied with the school organization than teachers with fewer years of experience teaching in the same school.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The Problem

The central problem of this study was an investigation of the relationships between local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers and teacher descriptions or perceptions of and satisfaction with the organization of certain specific high bureaucratic and low bureaucratic schools.

In addition, the principals were asked for their reactions to and perceptions of teachers, and these reactions were related to the local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers in these high and low bureaucratic schools.

Finally, an investigation was made of the relationships between certain selected teacher characteristics, on the one hand, and (1) their local-cosmopolitan role orientation, (2) their perception of the degree of school bureaucratization, and (3) their satisfaction with the school organization.

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 339 teachers in twenty schools, two in each of ten school systems in a central region of Alberta. The superintendents of these school systems had previously rated their schools on a scale from most bureaucratic to least bureaucratic. Only schools of the same type, that is, schools which included grades one to eleven, or grades one to twelve were used in this study, and only two schools, the one rated by the superintendent to be the most bureaucratic and the one rated least bureaucratic, in each school division or county were included in the study.

Instrumentation

The instrument used to measure local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers was a scale constructed for the study which consisted of sixteen local and cosmopolitan alternatives. Teachers were placed on a continuum from local, through an intermediate group designated LC, to cosmopolitan on the basis of their responses to this instrument. The validity of the instrument was tested by the use of data collected from a pilot sample (supra, pp. 34-36).

The instrument used to measure the degree of school bureaucratization was also constructed specifically for

the study; it consisted of a twelve-item scale on which superintendents and others familiar with the schools in question described organizational characteristics of the sample of schools. A pilot study was conducted to test the validity of this instrument. Similar instruments were constructed to measure teacher perceptions of the degree of bureaucratization of schools, and the level of teacher satisfaction with the school organization.

Methodology

Data on superintendents' description of level of school bureaucratization were collected by mail. The principals of the schools included in the study were asked to distribute and collect the teacher questionnaires and to return these together with their reactions to teachers. Replies were received from all principals and 91.87 per cent return of usable instruments was obtained from teachers.

The major analysis of the study made use of multiple linear regression; some use was also made of chi-square tests.

Sub-problems and Hypotheses

For purposes of this investigation the problem was divided into six sub-problems and one or more hypotheses were formulated for each of the sub-problems.

Hypothesis 1 investigated whether there was a significant relationship between teacher perceptions of the level of bureaucratization and the organizational classification of schools, while Hypothesis 2 concerned the relationship between teachers' perception of the level of bureaucratization and local-cosmopolitan role orientation. It was hypothesized that teachers would perceive higher degrees of bureaucracy in schools classified as high bureaucratic on the basis of superintendents' descriptions and that teachers who held a local orientation would perceive lower degrees of bureaucratization than would those who held a cosmopolitan orientation.

Hypothesis 3 investigated the relationship between degree of teacher satisfaction with the school organization and the organizational classification of schools. It was hypothesized that teachers would be more satisfied with low bureaucratic schools. Hypotheses 4 and 5 investigated the relationships between degree of teacher satisfaction with the school organizations and local-cosmopolitan role orientation. It was hypothesized that teachers who held a local orientation would be more satisfied with the school organization than would teachers who held a cosmopolitan orientation. It was also hypothesized that there would be an interaction effect, so that teachers who held a local role orientation would be more satisfied with the school organ-

ization in high bureaucratic schools, while teachers who held a cosmopolitan role orientation would be more satisfied with low bureaucratic schools.

Hypothesis 6 investigated the relationship between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and organizational or administrative reactions to teachers. It was hypothesized that teachers who held a local role orientation would be viewed more favorably as members of the organization by their principals than would teachers who held a cosmopolitan role orientation.

A number of personal and professional characteristics of teachers were investigated in an attempt to describe various groups of teachers. Hypothesis 7 investigated the relationships between these characteristics and local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers; Hypothesis 8 investigated the relationship between these characteristics and teacher perception of degree of school bureaucratization, and Hypothesis 9 investigated the relationships between these characteristics of teachers and degree of teacher satisfaction with the school organization.

Results

Hypothesis 1. Teacher descriptions of the level of bureaucratization is related to the organizational characteristics of the school; teachers perceive higher levels of bureaucracy in schools

classed as high bureaucratic and lower levels of bureaucracy in schools classed as low bureaucratic.

This hypothesis was supported by the data of the present study. While teacher perception of the level of bureaucratization was found to vary considerably from teacher to teacher, teachers in general perceived significantly higher levels of bureaucracy in schools that were classified as high bureaucratic on the basis of superintendents' descriptions, than they perceived in schools classified as low bureaucratic, even when satisfaction with the organization was held constant.

Hypothesis 2. Teacher descriptions of the level of bureaucracy is related to local-cosmopolitan role orientation; those who tend to have a local orientation perceive less bureaucratization than those who tend to have a cosmopolitan orientation.

The preceding hypothesis was not supported by the results of data and analysis in the present study. Any differences in perception of level of bureaucratization by locals and cosmopolitans was not large enough to be significant. When satisfaction with the organization was held constant, locals did not perceive significantly more or less bureaucratization than did cosmopolitans.

Hypothesis 3. Teachers, in general, are significantly more satisfied with low bureaucratic schools than with high bureaucratic schools.

The preceding hypothesis was not supported by the results of this study. Teachers were, in fact, significantly more satisfied with high bureaucratic schools. When teachers' perception of the level of bureaucracy was held constant, however, no significant relationships were found between teacher satisfaction and organizational classification of schools.

Hypothesis 4. Teachers classed as locals are significantly more satisfied with the school organizational characteristics than teachers who are classed as cosmopolitans.

The preceding hypothesis was supported statistically by the study. Locals were found to be significantly more satisfied with the school organization, and cosmopolitans were significantly less satisfied.

Hypothesis 5. Teacher satisfaction with the type of school organization is related to both local-cosmopolitan role orientation and degree of bureaucratization; locals tend to be more satisfied with high bureaucratic schools, while cosmopolitans tend to be more satisfied with low bureaucratic schools.

The relationship stated in the hypothesis was not supported by the present study. There were no significant relationships to show that locals might be more satisfied with high bureaucratic schools. It would appear that, while locals are more loyal to and satisfied with the organization generally, this loyalty is not affected by whether the organization is high or low in level of bureaucratic characteristics.

Hypothesis 6. Principals perceive teachers classed as locals as being significantly (1) more willing to undertake unexpected duties, (2) more likely to warrant promotion, (3) more trustworthy, (4) more likely to be elected to local Alberta Teachers' Association executive positions, and (5) more likely to be invited to social gatherings by principals than teachers classed as cosmopolitans.

Principals did not choose locals significantly more often than they chose cosmopolitans for any of the favorable responses in either high or low bureaucratic schools. When it came to stating which teachers they were less favorable towards, along certain dimensions, however, the principals chose cosmopolitans in one situation. There was a fairly significant relationship between cosmopolitan role orientation and those teachers whom the principals identified as being least willing to undertake some unexpected extra-curricular activities.

Hypothesis 7. Local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers is related to personal and professional characteristics of teachers.

The results of this study yield descriptions of those teachers who were found to be cosmopolitans, as well as those teachers who were found to be locals, in terms of certain selected characteristics.

No significant relationships were found between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and the following characteristics of teachers: sex; years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in the same school; number of systems

in which the teacher has taught; the average number of clock hours per week devoted to the teaching job; and marital status.

Significant relationships were found between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and the following characteristics of teachers: age of teachers; and whether the teachers had attended school in the district in which they were teaching. Even more significant differences existed between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and the following teacher characteristics: number of years of academic and professional training; grade level assignment; and the degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career.

Teachers who were cosmopolitans might, therefore, be described as being significantly different from teachers who were locals in that they had more years of academic and professional training, taught at a higher grade level, and had a lower degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career. Cosmopolitans were also somewhat younger than locals; and they were less likely to have attended school in the district in which they were teaching, than were locals.

Hypothesis 8. Teacher descriptions of the level of bureaucratization is related to personal and professional characteristics of teachers.

The personal and professional characteristics described are the same as those discussed in Hypothesis 7,

namely: age; number of years of academic and professional training; years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in same school; number of systems in which the teacher has taught; the average number of clock hours per week devoted to the teaching job; sex of teacher; marital status; grade level assignment; whether the teacher attended school in the district in which he is teaching; and the degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career.

Those teachers who perceived a higher level of bureaucratization could be described as likely to have the following characteristics: they had less training; they were more likely to be teaching at a lower grade level, and were more likely to be more satisfied with teaching as a career.

Hypothesis 9. Teachers' satisfaction with the school organization is related to personal and professional characteristics of teachers.

These teacher characteristics are: age; number of years of academic and professional training; years of teaching experience; years of experience teaching in same school; number of systems in which the teacher has taught; the average number of clock hours per week devoted to the teaching job; sex of teacher; marital status; grade level assignment; whether the teacher attended school in the district in which he is teaching; and the degree of satisfaction with teaching as a career.

As a result of the findings in this study, the only one of the teacher characteristics found to be significantly related to satisfaction of teachers with their school organization was teaching experience in the same school. The more years of experience a teacher had in the same school, the less satisfied was he likely to be with the organization of the school.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions presented here were arrived at on the basis of the evidence from the present study. They are subject to the limitations that characterize research of this type. It must be recognized that the samples of teachers and schools were not chosen as being representative samples of teachers and schools. The conclusions that follow are, therefore, strictly speaking, valid only for the schools included in the study.

(1) The findings of this study indicate that teachers may be meaningfully classified on a local-cosmopolitan scale. They may not only be classified as local teachers and cosmopolitan teachers, but gradations of "localism", and "cosmopolitanism" are possible. Teachers can therefore be described as more or less local, or as more or less cosmopolitan.

(2) The instruments which were developed for this study would appear to be discriminating and useful-- particularly the Instrument to Measure Local-Cosmopolitan Role Orientation and the School Bureaucracy Inventory.

(3) Teachers generally appear to be well able to distinguish between high bureaucratic and low bureaucratic schools. This finding lends support to the research designs which have relied upon teacher descriptions as a means of determining the level of bureaucracy in schools.

(4) There would appear to be no significant relationship between local-cosmopolitan role orientation and the level of bureaucratization perceived by teachers.

(5) Teacher satisfaction with the school organization is significantly related to the level of bureaucratization. There were indications that teachers' satisfaction may depend as much on perceived level of bureaucratization as it does on the degree of bureaucratization determined on some other basis.

(6) Locals appear to be more satisfied than cosmopolitans with the organizational characteristics of schools.

(7) There does not appear to be a significant relationship between teacher satisfaction with the structural characteristics of school organization and local-cosmopolitan role orientation of teachers. Locals

may be more satisfied with the organization generally, but this satisfaction does not appear to be affected by whether the organization is high or low in level of bureaucracy.

(8) The results of the investigation show that there is little, if any, difference between the way in which administrators react to cosmopolitans and the way they react to locals.

(9) From the results of this study, cosmopolitans may be described as those teachers who have more training but who are less satisfied with teaching as a career than locals. They would also appear to be younger, to be more likely to teach at a higher grade level, and to be less likely to have attended school in the local district than those teachers who are locals.

(10) Teachers who perceive higher degrees of bureaucracy in schools differ from those who perceive lower degrees of bureaucracy in that they have less training, they are more likely to be teaching at a lower grade level, and are more likely to be satisfied with teaching as a career.

(11) Teachers who have more years of experience teaching in the same school appear to be less satisfied with the school organization than those who have fewer years of experience teaching in the same school.

III. IMPLICATIONS

The findings and conclusions of this study have several implications for the practice of school administration. They also suggest a need for further research.

Implications for the Practice of School Administration

One implication of this study which school administrators should keep in mind is that teachers can be classified into several groups according to their role orientations and that teachers with different role orientations may have different approaches to their work, to their relationships with colleagues, and to relationships with the organization.

The result that locals were significantly more satisfied with their school organization than were cosmopolitans, has important implications for administrators. Possibly more effort could be put into the placement of teachers, and into integrating teachers into the local school and community, in an effort to have teachers become more satisfied with their school organization, and more thought might be given to modifying the school organization to make it more compatible with characteristics favored by cosmopolitans. Because of the nature of the membership of a school organization--that is, whether the teachers are locals or cosmopolitans--it might be desirable to modify

the organizational structure so as to better adapt the organization to the local-cosmopolitan role orientation of the individual members of the school organization.

Practicing school administrators should be cognizant of differences between locals and cosmopolitans. A realization of these differences might enable administrators to anticipate the different reactions of locals and cosmopolitans in specific situations, and so be better able to predict the different results of having people with different role orientations in these different situations. An understanding of the differences between local and cosmopolitan teachers might enable school administrators to make better provision for suitable role assignments for teachers.

There might be an interesting relationship between teacher local-cosmopolitan role orientation and whether a teacher is acceptable in a particular school. A closely-knit, homogeneous population might show hostility to outsiders and resent cosmopolitan teachers, whereas other populations might readily accept these same cosmopolitan teachers in their schools. It is quite likely that certain types of principals and schools accept cosmopolitans to a greater extent. This may also be true of others in the community, such as school board members.

Another of the implications arising from this study relates to the finding that teachers were more satisfied with schools which they perceived to be more bureaucratic than with schools which they perceived to be less bureaucratic. If teacher satisfaction is looked upon as being desirable, then these results may lead to changes in procedures employed by at least some school administrators.

Implications for Further Research

The study of educational administration has relied in recent years upon an interdisciplinary approach, drawing heavily on such other fields as sociology, psychology, political science, economics, and anthropology. Modern organizational theory has been applied more and more to studies of school organizations, and the present study has continued this trend. It would appear that much further research of this type is necessary.

More particularly, research could be done in fields other than that under investigation in the present study. The instruments constructed for use in this study, particularly the instrument to measure level of bureaucratization and the instrument to measure local-cosmopolitan role orientation should prove to be useful research instruments for further investigations into the area of bureaucracy in schools, and into local-cosmopolitan role orientation of

teachers. Much useful work could be done to improve these instruments. There would appear to be no reason why, for instance, these instruments could not be revised for use outside of schools, and to study individuals other than teachers.

Numerous research possibilities lie in the general area of bureaucracy, not only in the field of education, but also in other fields. A rather interesting finding in this study relates to the different relationships found between teacher satisfaction with the actual level of bureaucracy and the perceived level of bureaucracy. More research might well be done with this finding in mind.

While much research has been done, much still remains to be done in the area of teacher satisfaction. The matter of satisfaction with the school organization will have to be studied in more detail. Such questions as looking for an optimum point, such as teaching at a particular grade level, or having a certain number of years of experience at which teachers are most satisfied with the organization, might provide a starting place from which to delve deeper into reasons why these resulted in more or less satisfaction. The finding that locals are significantly more satisfied with their school organization, not only has implications for the placement of teachers, but for further research to find the reasons for this.

A longitudinal study of local-cosmopolitan role orientation might provide interesting insights into whether teachers' orientations change, and if so, in what direction, and as a result of what causes. As a teacher gains a wider range of experience and greater maturity, does the local community no longer comprise the bonds of a satisfying existence? Or does the teacher orient himself more and more with the local community so that over a period of time his goals and those of the community merge?

It would also appear to be profitable to investigate what intra-organizational factors operate to produce either local or cosmopolitan role orientation in teachers. Studies on influence structure such as that done by House (1) might provide a useful methodological tool for use in determining whether certain individuals are key persons in influencing others to become locals or cosmopolitans.

The findings in this study point the way to further research on role orientation and bureaucracy both in school organizations and in other fields. In addition, the study has provided researchers with several instruments in these areas which should be useful in further research.

REFERENCE FOR CHAPTER VII

- (1) House, J. H. "An Analysis of Interpersonal Relations Within a School Organization." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Bennis, W. G., K. D. Benne, and R. Chin. The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Blau, P. M. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1964.
- _____, and W. R. Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Bottenberg, R. A. and J. Ward. Applied Multiple Linear Regression. Technical Documentary Report. Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, 1963.
- Caplow, T. and R. J. McGee. The Academic Marketplace. New York: Basic Books, 1958.
- Ferguson, G. A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
- Gerth, W. W. and C. Wright Mills. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Gouldner, A. W. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. New York: The Free Press, 1954.
- Harris, C. M. and M. R. Liba (eds.). Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Third Edition. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960. pp. 1481-86.
- Kahn, R. L. et al. Organizational Stress. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
- Kornhauser, W. Scientists in Industry: Conflict and Accommodation. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.
- Lazarsfeld, P. T. and W. Thielens, Jr. The Academic Mind. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958.
- Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949.

_____, et al. (eds.). Sociology Today. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.

Presthus, R. The Organizational Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

Rogers, E. M. Diffusion of Innovations. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Wilensky, H. L. Intellectuals in Labor Unions. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1956.

B. PERIODICALS

Argyris, C. "The Individual and Organization: Some Problems of Mutual Adjustment," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:1-24, June, 1957.

Brumbaugh, R. B. "Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation and Teacher Attitudes Toward Reorganization," Administrator's Notebook, 12, March, 1964.

Coleman, J. et al. "The Diffusion of an Innovation," Sociometry, 20:253-270, 1957.

Eddy, W. P. "Teacher Characteristics and Grade IX Social Studies Achievement," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 9:254-263, December, 1963.

Gouldner, A. W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Role," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:281-306, December, 1957; 2:444-480, March, 1958.

Hall, R. H. "Intraorganizational Structural Variation: Application to the Bureaucratic Model," Administrative Science Quarterly, 7:295-308, 1962.

Moeller, G. M. "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power," Administrator's Notebook, 11, November, 1962.

- Parsons, T. "Social Structure and the Development of Personality Trends: Construction to the Integration of Psychology and Sociology," Psychiatry, 21:321-340, November, 1958.
- Peabody, R. L. "Perceptions of Occupational Authority - A Comparative Analysis," Administrative Science Quarterly, 6, June, 1961.
- Presthus, R. V. "Weberian v. Welfare Bureaucracy in Traditional Society," Administrative Science Quarterly, 6:6-24, June, 1961.
- Shibutani, T. "Reference Groups as Perspectives," American Journal of Sociology, 60, March, 1955.
- Sutthoff, John. "Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation and Participation in School Affairs," Administrator's Notebook, 9, November, 1960.
- Turner, R. H. "Role-Taking, Role-Standpoint and Reference Group Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, 61, January, 1956.
- Washbourne, C. "The Teacher in the Authority System," Journal of Educational Sociology, 30:390-394, May, 1957.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Division of Educational Research Services. "How to Build Your Own Models for Statistical Analysis." University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1965. (Mimeographed).
- Hartley, H. J. "Bureaucracy and Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation Examined with Selected Criterion Variables." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1964.
- House, J. H. "An Analysis of Interpersonal Influence Relations Within a School Organization." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.

- MacKay, D. A. "An Empirical Study of Bureaucratic Dimensions and Their Relation to Other Characteristics of School Organization." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.
- Marion, G. B. "A Study of Selected Factors Related to the Innovativeness of Elementary School Principals." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1966.
- Quinn, J. W. "An Investigation of Personality and Cognitive Correlates of Religious Devoutness." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1965.
- Robinson, N. "A Study of the Professional Role Orientations of Teachers and Principals and Their Relationship to Bureaucratic Characteristics of School Organizations." Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Alberta, 1966.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SECTION I

Department of Educational
Administration,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta,
February 6th, 1967.

Dear Teacher:

As part of my program at the University of Alberta, I am investigating some relationships among orientations, perceptions, and satisfactions of teachers. Before I begin the actual study, I need information regarding the reliability of some of the instruments I plan to use. I hope that you and the other teachers in this school will be good enough to answer the questions for me.

As this is the preliminary, pilot study, it would be quite in order, and in fact, much appreciated if you would write in any comments you might have regarding the questions themselves and the way in which the questions are worded.

Because Part I of the Questionnaire will be repeated in about two weeks to see if the questions are answered in the same way as the first time, it will be necessary to place a code number on each set of questions so that the later answers may be identified with the first set of answers.

Except for the comments, the data will be analyzed by computer and punched IBM cards. The analysis will therefore be quite impersonal. To further ensure anonymity, though, I have had the principal prepare a code which he alone knows and which he will destroy after he has collected the second set of sealed questionnaires and matched them with the first set.

Thank you in advance for your help in this study. The questions which this pilot study show to be useful will be given in various Alberta schools (not in this one again!) as part of a study of teachers and their school organization. Your help will therefore prove to be invaluable.

Sincerely,

W. P. Eddy

W. P. Eddy

PART I

INSTRUCTIONS: Choose the one alternative from each of the statements which more closely describes you and place a check mark in the blank space beside it.

1. Would you say that you get most of your intellectual and professional stimulation from:
 - A. discussions with your local colleagues? _____
 - B. other professional associates elsewhere, or professional reading? _____
2. Would you generally feel more satisfied with a teachers' meeting in which there is a discussion about:
 - A. a local school problem? _____
 - B. a general educational issue? _____
3. Do you believe that an important part of your job is to be well-liked by as many local people as possible?
 - A. Yes _____
 - B. No _____
4. Do you think that all teachers should try to take an active interest in community affairs?
 - A. Yes, they should _____
 - B. No, not unless they so desire _____
5. Do you belong to any voluntary educational organizations such as Specialists Councils of the ATA, etc.?
 - A. Yes _____
 - B. No _____

6. Would you encourage your students to return to this district to work upon graduation from high school or university?
- A. Yes _____
- B. No _____
7. What is the extent of your professional reading?
- A. Read no professional journals regularly _____
- B. Read one or more professional journals regularly _____
8. Do you regularly discuss new educational practices with other teachers?
- A. Yes, fairly often _____
- B. No, seldom do _____
9. Do you believe that an interest in and study of new procedures and practices makes your teaching job more satisfying?
- A. Yes _____
- B. No _____
10. Do you think that teachers ought to support local activities and businesses, even if it is somewhat inconvenient?
- A. Yes _____
- B. No _____
11. If local salary negotiations for next year do not bring about an increase in your salary, would you stay?
- A. Yes _____
- B. No _____
12. Would you accept a position outside of this school system which would mean a distinct improvement in your professional career?
- A. Yes _____
- B. No _____

13. Suppose a friend of yours was offered a teaching position at this school and also was offered a similar position at the same salary in a neighboring school. Which position would you advise him to accept?
- A. Position in neighboring school _____
- B. Position in this school _____
14. Do you feel that competent consultants for teachers' institutes:
- A. are available locally? _____
- B. must be brought in from outside? _____
15. Do you think that teachers should make every effort to live in the school district in which they teach?
- A. Yes _____
- B. No _____
16. Barring unforeseen changes, would you remain in your present teaching position permanently?
- A. Yes _____
- B. No _____
17. Would you use professional procedures and practices which you know are best, even though you are aware that this will cause much local friction?
- A. Yes _____
- B. No _____
18. Which type of meeting would you prefer to attend?
- A. school level meetings _____
- B. specialist council meetings _____
19. Somehow or other, there are few teachers around here with whom one can share his professional interests.
- A. Yes _____
- B. No _____

PART II

INSTRUCTIONS: There are five possible alternative answers for each of the following questions. Place a check mark (✓) in the space to the right of the ONE of these five answers which BEST describes your school.

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | (a) Duties are loosely defined, and each staff member is likely to have to "play by ear" and supplement where needed. | (b) The duties of each staff member are clearly defined, and he knows exactly where his responsibilities begin and where they end. |
| | Somewhat like (a) _____ | Somewhat like (b) _____ |
| | Much like (a) _____ | Much like (b) _____ |
| | Undecided _____ | |
| 2. | (a) Much attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school. | (b) Little attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school. |
| | Somewhat like (a) _____ | Somewhat like (b) _____ |
| | Much like (a) _____ | Much like (b) _____ |
| | Undecided _____ | |
| 3. | (a) The principal does not accept responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school. | (b) The principal accepts responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school. |
| | Somewhat like (a) _____ | Somewhat like (b) _____ |
| | Much like (a) _____ | Much like (b) _____ |
| | Undecided _____ | |

4. (a) Each staff member is directly responsible to someone higher in authority for his work. (b) Little emphasis is placed upon laying out the lines of authority in this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
5. (a) Procedures are developed to suit individual problems as they arise, rather than being explicitly stated beforehand in formal policy. (b) Decisions tend to be made by administrators on the basis of established, written school policies.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
6. (a) Staff members are very limited in the scope of their discretion in curriculum matters in this school. (b) Variations in curriculum are encouraged among the staff members of this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
7. (a) The staff members consider the principal to be on a social and professional par with them. (b) The principal, by virtue of his position, does not associate freely with other members in such informal situations as the staff room, after-school functions, etc.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

8. (a) The staff members in this school are likely to communicate with the superintendent or school board members only through established channels.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Staff members in this school feel free to talk directly to the superintendent or school board members about school matters.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
9. (a) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be made arbitrarily.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be based on qualifications and merit.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
10. (a) There is a sense of pride or esprit de corps among the staff members in this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Staff members in this school do not feel a sense of pride or esprit de corps.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

11. (a) Staff members in this school have almost complete autonomy in academic matters with very little interference by administrators.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Much like (a) _____

(b) Staff members are closely supervised in an effort to ensure efficient control and coordination.

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

12. (a) Staff members in this school may be thought of as components of a machine which stresses efficiency.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Much like (a) _____

(b) Stress is not placed on efficiency in this school.

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

PART III

DEGREE OF SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION
WITH SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

INSTRUCTIONS: How satisfied are you with the extent to which this school exhibits each of the following characteristics? There are five possible alternative answers for each statement. They are as follows:

VS - Very Satisfied
 S - Satisfied
 ? - Satisfied in some ways; not in others
 D - Dissatisfied
 VD - Very Dissatisfied

Circle ONE answer for each item.

- | | | | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. | How well satisfied are you with the way in which the duties of staff members are assigned in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 2. | How well satisfied are you with the attention that is given to assigning staff members to their subject and/or grade specialty in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 3. | How well satisfied are you with the degree to which the principal assumes responsibility for decisions and actions of his teachers in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 4. | How well satisfied are you with the amount of emphasis that is placed upon laying out the lines of authority in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 5. | How well satisfied are you with the degree to which decisions are based on established, written policies in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 6. | How well satisfied are you with the amount of freedom given to staff members in curriculum matters in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 7. | How well satisfied are you with the degree to which the principal is considered to be on a social and professional par with the teachers in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 8. | How well satisfied are you with the degree to which staff members in this school feel free to talk directly to the superintendent or school board members about school matters? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 9. | How well satisfied are you with the factors which seem to result in recognition and advancement in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 10. | How well satisfied are you with the <u>esprit de corps</u> or sense of pride that staff members have in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 11. | How well satisfied are you with the degree to and manner in which staff members are supervised in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 12. | How well satisfied are you with the amount of stress placed on efficiency in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |

TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

1. Please indicate your sex. Check one.

1. Male 2. Female

1. _____ Single, never married
2. _____ Married
3. _____ Widowed, divorced, or separated

1.	_____	Under 21 years	6.	_____	41 to 45 years
2.	_____	21 to 25 years	7.	_____	46 to 55 years
3.	_____	26 to 30 years	8.	_____	56 to 65 years
4.	_____	31 to 35 years	9.	_____	66 and over
5.	_____	36 to 40 years			

1. _____ Less than two complete years
2. _____ Two years
3. _____ Three years
4. _____ Four years
5. _____ Five years
6. _____ Six or more years

1. _____ 1 year or less 6. _____ 12 to 15 years
2. _____ 2 or 3 years 7. _____ 16 to 20 years
3. _____ 4 or 5 years 8. _____ 21 to 30 years
4. _____ 6 or 7 years 9. _____ Over 30 years
5. _____ 8 to 11 years

6. Counting the present school year, what is the total number of school years of full-time teaching experience you have had in this school? Check one.

- | | | | |
|----------|----------------|----------|------------------|
| 1. _____ | 1 year or less | 6. _____ | 6 or 7 years |
| 2. _____ | 2 years | 7. _____ | 8 or 9 years |
| 3. _____ | 3 years | 8. _____ | 10 or 11 years |
| 4. _____ | 4 years | 9. _____ | 12 or more years |
| 5. _____ | 5 years | | |

7. Since you began teaching, in how many different school systems have you taught full-time? Check one.

- | | | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1. _____ | 1 system | 4. _____ | 4 systems |
| 2. _____ | 2 systems | 5. _____ | 5 systems |
| 3. _____ | 3 systems | 6. _____ | 6 systems or more |

8. What is your present teaching assignment? If you teach at several levels check the one with which you spend the most time. Check one.

- | | | | |
|----------|---------------|----------|-------------------------|
| 1. _____ | Grades 1 to 3 | 4. _____ | Grades 10 to 12 |
| 2. _____ | Grades 4 to 6 | 5. _____ | Non-teaching |
| 3. _____ | Grades 7 to 9 | | principal or supervisor |

9. Did you attend school in the district in which you now live? Check one.

- | | |
|----------|-----|
| 1. _____ | Yes |
| 2. _____ | No |

10. Are you satisfied with teaching as a career (regardless of your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with your present position)? Check one.

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 1. _____ | Like it very much. |
| 2. _____ | Like it; however, there are other jobs I like just as much. |
| 3. _____ | It is all right, but there are better jobs. |
| 4. _____ | Don't like it as well as other jobs. |
| 5. _____ | Dislike it very much. |

11. What is the average number of clock hours per week that you devote to your teaching job? Include all time spent in activities which are required or definitely expected of you, whether you do your work at home, at school, or elsewhere. Check one.

- | | | | | | |
|----|-------|----------------|----|-------|------------------|
| 1. | _____ | Under 30 hours | 6. | _____ | 50 to 54 hours |
| 2. | _____ | 30 to 34 hours | 7. | _____ | 55 to 59 hours |
| 3. | _____ | 35 to 39 hours | 8. | _____ | 60 to 64 hours |
| 4. | _____ | 40 to 44 hours | 9. | _____ | 65 hours or more |
| 5. | _____ | 45 to 49 hours | | | |

SECTION II

INSTRUCTIONS: Choose the one alternative from each of the statements which more closely describes you and place a check mark in the blank space beside it.

1. Would you say that you get most of your intellectual and professional stimulation from:
 - A. discussions with your local colleagues? _____
 - B. other professional associates elsewhere, or professional reading? _____
2. Would you generally feel more satisfied with a teachers' meeting in which there is a discussion about:
 - A. a local school problem? _____
 - B. a general educational issue? _____
3. Do you believe that an important part of your job is to be well-liked by as many local people as possible?
 - A. Yes _____
 - B. No _____
4. Do you think that all teachers should try to take an active interest in community affairs?
 - A. Yes, they should _____
 - B. No, not unless they so desire _____
5. Do you belong to any voluntary educational organizations such as Specialists Councils of the ATA, etc.?
 - A. Yes _____
 - B. No _____
6. Would you encourage your students to return to this district to work upon graduation from high school or university?
 - A. Yes _____
 - B. No _____

7. What is the extent of your professional reading?
- A. Read no professional journals regularly _____
 - B. Read one or more professional journals regularly _____
8. Do you regularly discuss new educational practices with other teachers?
- A. Yes, fairly often _____
 - B. No, seldom do _____
9. Do you believe that an interest in and study of new procedures and practices makes your teaching job more satisfying?
- A. Yes _____
 - B. No _____
10. Do you think that teachers ought to support local activities and businesses, even if it is somewhat inconvenient?
- A. Yes _____
 - B. No _____
11. If local salary negotiations for next year do not bring about an increase in your salary, would you stay?
- A. Yes _____
 - B. No _____
12. Would you accept a position outside of this school system which would mean a distinct improvement in your professional career?
- A. Yes _____
 - B. No _____
13. Suppose a friend of yours was offered a teaching position at this school and also was offered a similar position at the same salary in a neighboring school. Which position would you advise him to accept?
- A. Position in neighboring school _____
 - B. Position in this school _____

14. Do you feel that competent consultants for teachers' institutes:
A. are available locally? _____
B. must be brought in from outside? _____
15. Do you think that teachers should make every effort to live in the school district in which they teach?
A. Yes _____
B. No _____
16. Barring unforeseen changes, would you remain in your present teaching position permanently?
A. Yes _____
B. No _____
17. Would you use professional procedures and practices which you know are best, even though you are aware that this will cause much local friction?
A. Yes _____
B. No _____
18. Which type of meeting would you prefer to attend?
A. school level meetings _____
B. specialist council meetings _____
19. Somehow or other, there are few teachers around here with whom one can share his professional interests.
A. Yes _____
B. No _____

SECTION III

PRINCIPAL'S PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS' LOCAL-
COSMOPOLITAN ROLE ORIENTATION

	Local					Cosmopolitan
Teacher 1	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 2	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 3	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 4	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 5	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 6	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 7	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 8	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 9	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 10	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 11	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 12	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 13	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Teacher 14	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>

	Local					Cosmopolitan
Teacher 15	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6
Teacher 16	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6
Teacher 17	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6
Teacher 18	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6
Teacher 19	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6
Teacher 20	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX B

Department of Educational
Administration,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta,
February 6th, 1967.

Dear

As part of my doctoral program at the University of Alberta this year I am conducting a study in which I plan to measure certain relationships between orientations, perceptions, and satisfactions of teachers in high bureaucratic and low bureaucratic schools. All schools will necessarily be bureaucratic to some extent, but some schools will be more bureaucratic than others. I need some help in deciding whether my instrument to measure the level of bureaucratization of schools actually distinguishes the high bureaucratic from the low bureaucratic schools. I am therefore asking your help. Your answers to the enclosed instrument should help me decide whether it is a good measure or not.

Choose from all the schools with which you have had any experience the one which you would consider to be the most bureaucratic and the one which you would consider to be the least bureaucratic. Fill in the blanks which best describe the schools on the appropriate enclosed instruments. Thank you in advance for your help.

If for some reason you do not wish to complete the instruments, please place them in the enclosed envelope and mail them back to me unanswered.

Yours sincerely,

W. P. Eddy

W. P. Eddy

Encl.

MOST BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOL

PART I

INSTRUCTIONS: There are five possible alternative answers for each of the following questions. Place a check mark (✓) in the space to the right of the ONE of these five answers which BEST describes your school.

1. (a) Duties are loosely defined, and each staff member is likely to have to "play by ear" and supplement where needed.

Somewhat like (a) _____
Much like (a) _____

Undecided _____
- (b) The duties of each staff member are clearly defined, and he knows exactly where his responsibilities begin and where they end.

Somewhat like (b) _____
Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____
2. (a) Much attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school.

Somewhat like (a) _____
Much like (a) _____

Undecided _____
- (b) Little attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school.

Somewhat like (b) _____
Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____
3. (a) The principal does not accept responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school.

Somewhat like (a) _____
Much like (a) _____

Undecided _____
- (b) The principal accepts responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school.

Somewhat like (b) _____
Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

4. (a) Each staff member is directly responsible to someone higher in authority for his work. (b) Little emphasis is placed upon laying out the lines of authority in this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
5. (a) Procedures are developed to suit individual problems as they arise, rather than being explicitly stated beforehand in formal policy. (b) Decisions tend to be made by administrators on the basis of established, written school policies.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
6. (a) Staff members are very limited in the scope of their discretion in curriculum matters in this school. (b) Variations in curriculum are encouraged among the staff members of this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
7. (a) The staff members consider the principal to be on a social and professional par with them. (b) The principal, by virtue of his position, does not associate freely with other members in such informal situations as the staff room, after-school functions, etc.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

8. (a) The staff members in this school are likely to communicate with the superintendent or school board members only through established channels.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Staff members in this school feel free to talk directly to the superintendent or school board members about school matters.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
9. (a) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be made arbitrarily.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be based on a staff member's qualifications and merit.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
10. (a) There is a sense of pride or esprit de corps among the staff members in this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Staff members in this school do not feel a sense of pride or esprit de corps.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

11. (a) Staff members in this school have almost complete autonomy in academic matters with very little interference by administrators.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Staff members are closely supervised in an effort to ensure efficient control and coordination.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
12. (a) Staff members in this school may be thought of as components of a machine which stresses efficiency.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Stress is not placed on efficiency in this school.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

PART II

Confidence in Judgment

On the whole, how much confidence do you feel in your rating of this school? Circle the number showing your degree of confidence.

Almost no confidence at all	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	Very high confidence
--------------------------------	----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

LEAST BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOL

PART III

INSTRUCTIONS: There are five possible alternative answers for each of the following questions. Place a check mark (✓) in the space to the right of the ONE of these five answers which BEST describes your school.

1. (a) Duties are loosely defined, and each staff member is likely to have to "play by ear" and supplement where needed.

 Somewhat like (a) _____
 Much like (a) _____
 Undecided _____
- (b) The duties of each staff member are clearly defined, and he knows exactly where his responsibilities begin and where they end.

 Somewhat like (b) _____
 Much like (b) _____
 Undecided _____
2. (a) Much attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school.

 Somewhat like (a) _____
 Much like (a) _____
 Undecided _____
- (b) Little attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school.

 Somewhat like (b) _____
 Much like (b) _____
 Undecided _____
3. (a) The principal does not accept responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school.

 Somewhat like (a) _____
 Much like (a) _____
 Undecided _____
- (b) The principal accepts responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school.

 Somewhat like (b) _____
 Much like (b) _____
 Undecided _____

4. (a) Each staff member is directly responsible to someone higher in authority for his work. (b) Little emphasis is placed upon laying out the lines of authority in this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
5. (a) Procedures are developed to suit individual problems as they arise, rather than being explicitly stated beforehand in formal policy. (b) Decisions tend to be made by administrators on the basis of established, written school policies.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
6. (a) Staff members are very limited in the scope of their discretion in curriculum matters in this school. (b) Variations in curriculum are encouraged among the staff members of this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
7. (a) The staff members consider the principal to be on a social and professional par with them. (b) The principal, by virtue of his position, does not associate freely with other members in such informal situations as the staff room, after-school functions, etc.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

8. (a) The staff members in this school are likely to communicate with the superintendent or school board members only through established channels. (b) Staff members in this school feel free to talk directly to the superintendent or school board members about school matters.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

9. (a) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be made arbitrarily. (b) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be based on a staff member's qualifications and merit.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

10. (a) There is a sense of pride or esprit de corps among the staff members in this school. (b) Staff members in this school do not feel a sense of pride or esprit de corps.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

11. (a) Staff members in this school have almost complete autonomy in academic matters with very little interference by administrators.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Staff members are closely supervised in an effort to ensure efficient control and coordination.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
12. (a) Staff members in this school may be thought of as components of a machine which stresses efficiency.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Stress is not placed on efficiency in this school.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

PART IV

Confidence in Judgment

On the whole, how much confidence do you feel in your rating of this school? Circle the number showing your degree of confidence.

Almost no confidence at all	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	Very high confidence
--------------------------------	----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

APPENDIX C

MOST BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOL

PART I

SCHOOL BUREAUCRACY INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS: There are five possible alternative answers for each of the following questions. Place a check mark (✓) in the space to the right of the ONE of these five answers which BEST describes your school.

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | (a) Duties are loosely defined, and each staff member is likely to have to "play by ear" and supplement where needed. | (b) The duties of each staff member are clearly defined, and he knows exactly where his responsibilities begin and where they end. |
| | Somewhat like (a) _____ | Somewhat like (b) _____ |
| | Much like (a) _____ | Much like (b) _____ |
| | Undecided _____ | |
| 2. | (a) Much attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school. | (b) Little attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school. |
| | Somewhat like (a) _____ | Somewhat like (b) _____ |
| | Much like (a) _____ | Much like (b) _____ |
| | Undecided _____ | |
| 3. | (a) The principal does not accept responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school. | (b) The principal accepts responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school. |
| | Somewhat like (a) _____ | Somewhat like (b) _____ |
| | Much like (a) _____ | Much like (b) _____ |
| | Undecided _____ | |

4. (a) Each staff member is directly responsible to someone higher in authority for his work. (b) Little emphasis is placed upon laying out the lines of authority in this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
5. (a) Procedures are developed to suit individual problems as they arise, rather than being explicitly stated beforehand in formal policy. (b) Decisions tend to be made by administrators on the basis of established, written school policies.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
6. (a) Staff members are very limited in the scope of their discretion in curriculum matters in this school. (b) Variations in curriculum are encouraged among the staff members of this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
7. (a) The staff members consider the principal to be on a social and professional par with them. (b) The principal, by virtue of his position, does not associate freely with other members in such informal situations as the staff room, after-school functions, etc.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

8. (a) The staff members in this school are likely to communicate with the superintendent or school board members only through established channels. (b) Staff members in this school feel free to talk directly to the superintendent or school board members about school matters.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

9. (a) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be made arbitrarily. (b) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be based on a staff member's qualifications and merit.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

10. (a) There is a sense of loyalty and pride in the organization among the staff members in this school. (b) Staff members in this school do not feel a sense of loyalty and pride in the organization.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

11. (a) Staff members in this school have almost complete autonomy in academic matters with very little interference by administrators.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Staff members are closely supervised in an effort to ensure efficient control and coordination.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
12. (a) Staff members in this school may be thought of as components of a machine which stresses efficiency.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Stress is not placed on efficiency in this school.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

PART II

Confidence in Judgment

On the whole, how much confidence do you feel in your rating of this school? Circle the number showing your degree of confidence.

Almost no confidence at all	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	Very high confidence
--------------------------------	----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

LEAST BUREAUCRATIC SCHOOL

PART III

SCHOOL BUREAUCRACY INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS: There are five possible alternative answers for each of the following questions. Place a check mark (✓) in the space to the right of the ONE of these five answers which BEST describes your school.

1. (a) Duties are loosely defined, and each staff member is likely to have to "play by ear" and supplement where needed.

 Somewhat like (a) _____
 Much like (a) _____
 Undecided _____
- (b) The duties of each staff member are clearly defined, and he knows exactly where his responsibilities begin and where they end.

 Somewhat like (b) _____
 Much like (b) _____
 Undecided _____
2. (a) Much attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school.

 Somewhat like (a) _____
 Much like (a) _____
 Undecided _____
- (b) Little attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school.

 Somewhat like (b) _____
 Much like (b) _____
 Undecided _____
3. (a) The principal does not accept responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school.

 Somewhat like (a) _____
 Much like (a) _____
 Undecided _____
- (b) The principal accepts responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school.

 Somewhat like (b) _____
 Much like (b) _____
 Undecided _____

4. (a) Each staff member is directly responsible to someone higher in authority for his work. (b) Little emphasis is placed upon laying out the lines of authority in this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
5. (a) Procedures are developed to suit individual problems as they arise, rather than being explicitly stated beforehand in formal policy. (b) Decisions tend to be made by administrators on the basis of established, written school policies.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
6. (a) Staff members are very limited in the scope of their discretion in curriculum matters in this school. (b) Variations in curriculum are encouraged among the staff members of this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
7. (a) The staff members consider the principal to be on a social and professional par with them. (b) The principal, by virtue of his position, does not associate freely with other members in such informal situations as the staff room, after-school functions, etc.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

8. (a) The staff members in this school are likely to communicate with the superintendent or school board members only through established channels. (b) Staff members in this school feel free to talk directly to the superintendent or school board members about school matters.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

9. (a) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be made arbitrarily. (b) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be based on a staff member's qualifications and merit.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

10. (a) There is a sense of loyalty and pride in the organization among the staff members in this school. (b) Staff members in this school do not feel a sense of loyalty and pride in the organization.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

11. (a) Staff members in this school have almost complete autonomy in academic matters with very little interference by administrators.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Staff members are closely supervised in an effort to ensure efficient control and coordination.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
12. (a) Staff members in this school may be thought of as components of a machine which stresses efficiency.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Stress is not placed on efficiency in this school.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

PART IV

Confidence in Judgment

On the whole, how much confidence do you feel in your rating of this school? Circle the number showing your degree of confidence.

Almost no confidence at all	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5	6	Very high confidence
--------------------------------	----------	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------

APPENDIX D

Department of Educational
Administration,
University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta,
March, 1967.

Dear Teacher:

As part of my program at the University of Alberta, I am investigating some relationships among orientations, perceptions, and satisfactions of teachers in a number of Alberta schools. I hope that you and the other teachers in this school will be good enough to answer the questions for me so that I may complete this study.

It will be necessary to place a code number on each set of questions for preliminary identification purposes; however, the data will be analyzed by computer and punched IBM cards and therefore the analysis will be quite impersonal. To further ensure anonymity, though, I have had the principal prepare a code which he alone knows and which he will destroy after he has collected all of the sealed questionnaires.

Thank you in advance for your help in this study. It is hoped that the study will be of value in furthering knowledge of teachers and their school organization.

TEACHER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

INSTRUCTIONS: Choose the one alternative from each of the statements which more closely describes you and place a check mark in the blank space beside it.

1. Would you say that you get most of your intellectual and professional stimulation from:

(a) discussions with your local colleagues? _____

(b) other professional associates elsewhere, or professional reading? _____

2. Would you generally feel more satisfied with a teachers' meeting in which there is a discussion about:

(a) a local school problem? _____

(b) a general educational issue? _____

3. Do you believe that an important part of your job is to be well-liked by as many local people as possible?

(a) Yes _____

(b) No _____

4. Do you think that all teachers should try to take an active interest in community affairs?

(a) Yes, they should _____

(b) No, not unless they so desire _____

5. Would you encourage your students to return to this district to work upon graduation from high school or university?
- (a) Yes _____
- (b) No _____
6. What is the extent of your professional reading?
- (a) Read no professional journals regularly _____
- (b) Read one or more professional journals regularly _____
7. Do you regularly discuss new educational practices with other teachers?
- (a) Yes, fairly often _____
- (b) No, seldom do _____
8. Do you think that teachers ought to support local activities and businesses, even if it is somewhat inconvenient?
- (a) Yes _____
- (b) No _____
9. If local salary negotiations for next year do not bring about an increase in your salary, would you stay?
- (a) Yes _____
- (b) No _____
10. Would you accept a position outside of this school system which would mean a distinct improvement in your professional career?
- (a) Yes _____
- (b) No _____

11. Suppose a friend of yours was offered a teaching position at this school and also was offered a similar position at the same salary in a neighboring school. Which position would you advise him to accept?
- (a) Position in neighboring school _____
- (b) Position in this school _____
12. Do you feel that competent consultants for teachers' institutes:
- (a) are available locally? _____
- (b) must be brought in from outside? _____
13. Do you think that teachers should make every effort to live in the school district in which they teach?
- (a) Yes _____
- (b) No _____
14. Barring unforeseen changes, would you remain in your present teaching position permanently?
- (a) Yes _____
- (b) No _____
15. Would you use professional procedures and practices which you know are best, even though you are aware that this will cause much local friction?
- (a) Yes _____
- (b) No _____
16. Which type of meeting would you prefer to attend?
- (a) School level meetings _____
- (b) Specialist council meetings _____

PART II

INSTRUCTIONS: There are five possible alternative answers for each of the following questions. Place a check mark (✓) in the space to the right of the ONE of these five answers which BEST describes your school.

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | (a) Duties are loosely defined, and each staff member is likely to have to "play by ear" and supplement where needed. | (b) The duties of each staff member are clearly defined, and he knows exactly where his responsibilities begin and where they end. |
| | Somewhat like (a) _____ | Somewhat like (b) _____ |
| | Much like (a) _____ | Much like (b) _____ |
| | Undecided _____ | |
| 2. | (a) Much attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school. | (b) Little attention is given to the assigning of staff members to teach their subject and/or grade specialty in this school. |
| | Somewhat like (a) _____ | Somewhat like (b) _____ |
| | Much like (a) _____ | Much like (b) _____ |
| | Undecided _____ | |
| 3. | (a) The principal does not accept responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school. | (b) The principal accepts responsibility for the decisions and actions of teachers in this school. |
| | Somewhat like (a) _____ | Somewhat like (b) _____ |
| | Much like (a) _____ | Much like (b) _____ |
| | Undecided _____ | |

4. (a) Each staff member is directly responsible to someone higher in authority for his work. (b) Little emphasis is placed upon laying out the lines of authority in this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
5. (a) Procedures are developed to suit individual problems as they arise, rather than being explicitly stated beforehand in formal policy. (b) Decisions tend to be made by administrators on the basis of established, written school policies.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
6. (a) Staff members are very limited in the scope of their discretion in curriculum matters in this school. (b) Variations in curriculum are encouraged among the staff members of this school.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
7. (a) The staff members consider the principal to be on a social and professional par with them. (b) The principal, by virtue of his position, does not associate freely with other members in such informal situations as the staff room, after-school functions, etc.
- Somewhat like (a) _____ Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (a) _____ Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

8. (a) The staff members in this school are likely to communicate with the superintendent or school board members only through established channels. (b) Staff members in this school feel free to talk directly to the superintendent or school board members about school matters.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

9. (a) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be made arbitrarily. (b) There is a tendency for recognition and advancement in this school to be based on a staff member's qualifications and merit.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

10. (a) There is a sense of loyalty and pride in the organization among the staff members in this school. (b) Staff members in this school do not feel a sense of loyalty and pride in the organization.

Somewhat like (a) _____

Somewhat like (b) _____

Much like (a) _____

Much like (b) _____

Undecided _____

11. (a) Staff members in this school have almost complete autonomy in academic matters with very little interference by administrators.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Staff members are closely supervised in an effort to ensure efficient control and coordination.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____
12. (a) Staff members in this school may be thought of as components of a machine which stresses efficiency.
- Somewhat like (a) _____
- Much like (a) _____
- Undecided _____
- (b) Stress is not placed on efficiency in this school.
- Somewhat like (b) _____
- Much like (b) _____
- Undecided _____

PART III

DEGREE OF SATISFACTION OR DISSATISFACTION WITH
SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

INSTRUCTIONS: How satisfied are you with the extent to which this school exhibits each of the following characteristics? There are five possible alternative answers for each statement. They are as follows:

VS -- Very Satisfied.
S -- Satisfied.
? -- Satisfied in some ways;
not in others.
D -- Dissatisfied.
VD -- Very Dissatisfied.

Circle ONE answer for each item.

- | | | | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. | How well satisfied are you with the way in which the duties of staff members are assigned in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 2. | How well satisfied are you with the attention that is given to assigning staff members to their subject and/or grade specialty in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 3. | How well satisfied are you with the degree to which the principal assumes responsibility for decisions and actions of his teachers in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 4. | How well satisfied are you with the amount of emphasis that is placed upon laying out the lines of authority in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 5. | How well satisfied are you with the degree to which decisions are based on established, written policies in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 6. | How well satisfied are you with the amount of freedom given to staff members in curriculum matters in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 7. | How well satisfied are you with the degree to which the principal is considered to be on a social and professional par with the teachers in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 8. | How well satisfied are you with the degree to which staff members in this school feel free to talk directly to the superintendent or school board members about school matters? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 9. | How well satisfied are you with the factors which seem to result in recognition and advancement in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 10. | How well satisfied are you with the sense of loyalty and pride in the organization that staff members have in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 11. | How well satisfied are you with the degree to and manner in which staff members are supervised in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |
| 12. | How well satisfied are you with the amount of stress placed on efficiency in this school? | VS | S | ? | D | VD |

PART IV

TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer every question in this section. The questions that follow can be answered by a check mark (✓). Please check carefully in space provided.

1. Please indicate your sex. Check one.

(a) _____ Male

(b) _____ Female

2. Please indicate your marital status. Check one.

(a) _____ Single, never married

(b) _____ Married

(c) _____ Widowed, divorced, or separated

3. What is your age (nearest birthday)?

(a) _____ Under 21 years

(f) _____ 41 to 45 years

(b) _____ 21 to 25 years

(g) _____ 46 to 55 years

(c) _____ 26 to 30 years

(h) _____ 56 to 65 years

(d) _____ 31 to 35 years

(i) _____ 66 and over

(e) _____ 36 to 40 years

4. What is the extent of your total academic and professional preparation beyond high school? (Disregard fractions of years.) Check one.

(a) _____ Less than two complete years

(b) _____ Two years

(c) _____ Three years

(d) _____ Four years

(e) _____ Five years

(f) _____ Six or more years

5. Counting the present school year, what is the total number of school years of full-time teaching experience you have had? Check one.

(a) _____ 1 year or less

(f) _____ 12 to 15 years

(b) _____ 2 or 3 years

(g) _____ 16 to 20 years

(c) _____ 4 or 5 years

(h) _____ 21 to 30 years

(d) _____ 6 or 7 years

(i) _____ Over 30 years

(e) _____ 8 to 11 years

6. Counting the present school year, what is the total number of school years of full-time teaching experience you have had in this school? Check one.
- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| (a) _____ 1 year or less | (f) _____ 6 or 7 years |
| (b) _____ 2 years | (g) _____ 8 or 9 years |
| (c) _____ 3 years | (h) _____ 10 or 11 years |
| (d) _____ 4 years | (i) _____ 12 or more years |
| (e) _____ 5 years | |
7. Since you began teaching, in how many different school systems have you taught full-time? Check one.
- | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| (a) _____ 1 system | (d) _____ 4 systems |
| (b) _____ 2 systems | (e) _____ 5 systems |
| (c) _____ 3 systems | (f) _____ 6 systems or more |
8. What is your present teaching assignment? If you teach at several levels check the one with which you spend the most time. Check one.
- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| (a) _____ Grades 1 to 3 | (d) _____ Grades 10 to 12 |
| (b) _____ Grades 4 to 6 | (e) _____ Non-teaching |
| (c) _____ Grades 7 to 9 | principal or supervisor |
9. Did you attend school in the district in which you now live? Check one.
- | | |
|---------------|--------------|
| (a) _____ Yes | (b) _____ No |
|---------------|--------------|
10. Are you satisfied with teaching as a career (regardless of your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with your present position)? Check one.
- | |
|---|
| (a) _____ Like it very much. |
| (b) _____ Like it; however, there are other jobs I like just as much. |
| (c) _____ It is all right, but there are better jobs. |
| (d) _____ Don't like it as well as other jobs. |
| (e) _____ Dislike it very much. |

11. What is the average number of clock hours per week that you devote to your teaching job? Include all time spent in activities which are required or definitely expected of you, whether you do your work at home, at school, or elsewhere. Check one.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|----------------|-----|-----------------|------------------|
| (a) | <u> </u> | Under 30 hours | (f) | <u> </u> | 50 to 54 hours |
| (b) | <u> </u> | 30 to 34 hours | (g) | <u> </u> | 55 to 59 hours |
| (c) | <u> </u> | 35 to 39 hours | (h) | <u> </u> | 60 to 64 hours |
| (d) | <u> </u> | 40 to 44 hours | (i) | <u> </u> | 65 hours or more |
| (e) | <u> </u> | 45 to 49 hours | | | |

APPENDIX E

PRINCIPAL'S REACTION TO TEACHERS

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer each question by naming the teacher or teachers who best exemplify each of the following:

- (1) Which teachers in your school would be more willing to undertake some unexpected extracurricular duties?
- (2) Which teachers in your school would be less willing to undertake some unexpected extracurricular duties?
- (3) Which teachers in your school would you think you might recommend for promotion to vice-principal of a school?
- (4) Which teachers in your school would you think you might be least likely to recommend for a promotion?
- (5) Which teachers in your school could best be trusted to work on their own?
- (6) Which teachers in your school could least be trusted to work on their own?
- (7) If you were planning a social gathering, which teachers in your school would you be most likely to invite to attend?
- (8) If you were planning a social gathering, which teachers in your school would you be least likely to invite to attend?

- (9) Which teachers in your school would you consider to be most likely to be elected to the position of president of your ATA local?

- (10) Which teachers in your school would you consider to be least likely to be elected to an executive position in your ATA local?

The above questions will form the basis for an interview with each school principal. Although principals will be encouraged to name two teachers for each question asked, some principals may have more or less than two who fit into certain of the categories.

APPENDIX F

DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON SAMPLE: NUMBER OF FULL-TIME
TEACHERS REPORTED BY SCHOOLS

High Bureaucratic Schools		Low Bureaucratic Schools	
	24		24
	12		17
	19		16
	25		24
	31		24
	15		10
	11		13
	14		18
	7		17
	26		22
Totals	184		185

University of Alberta Library



0 1620 1067 0105

B29886